THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER

XIX-  -XX

A MONTHLY REVIEW

EDITED BY JAMES KNOWLES

VOL. LVIII

JULY—DECEMBER 1905

LONDON
SPOTTISWOODE & CO. LTD., PRINTERS
NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.
1905

(*The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved*)

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER



No. CCCLIX—JANUARY 1907

THE EDUCATION BILL OF 1906 AND THE FUTURE OF POPULAR EDUCATION

THE Education Bill is gone. After a stormy voyage, and after the jettison of many valuable provisions, it has foundered in sight of the port in which its battered hull and damaged cargo might have found shelter.

There were two main principles in the Bill which were nominally accepted by all: (1) Universal public management; (2) The abolition of tests for teachers.

But, as is not uncommon in English legislation, these principles were not fully carried out even in the Government scheme, and they were further assailed by various sections of the Opposition. Those who listened to the long debates must have sometimes got a little tired of professions like those of the Archbishop of Canterbury that he would not favour any wrecking amendments, and they must have smiled at the latest attempt of Lord Lansdowne to count up the number of Opposition amendments and those proposed by Lord Crewe, and then to [redacted] that the Government alterations were

more extensive than those of the Opposition. A well-directed thrust through the body is more fatal than a conspicuous rent in the outer garments.

'Tis not as deep as a well nor as wide as a church door, but it will serve.

Before we consider what is the best course of action for the Liberal party in future, let us briefly sum up what led to the dead Bill and what that dead Bill would have done.

There is no need to dwell upon relatively ancient history. Everyone knows that from the first beginning of State aid to education down to the Act of 1870 popular education was almost entirely in the hands of the Established Church, which not only opposed with all its great political and social force the establishment of a system publicly maintained and publicly managed, but strove, while accepting State aid, to keep State interference within the narrowest limits.

The Act of 1870, by introducing the new force of the elected School Board supported by the rates, introduced that which was bound gradually to supersede the old privately managed system under ecclesiastical control.

The Voluntary schools were allowed to subsist and to obtain increased Government grants, on condition that one-half their income should be derived from local effort.

It is not necessary to recapitulate how this obligation was systematically evaded and weakened, even to such an extent as to reckon Parliamentary grants paid by the Science and Art department as contributions which should be accepted as filling up the gap and as preventing the diminution of the ordinary Parliamentary grant.

The Statute book from 1870 down to 1902 is full of enactments one after another diminishing or removing the obligations which Mr. Gladstone laid down as essential to his scheme of continued recognition and Parliamentary aid, and, in addition, the Board of Education has systematically administered the Acts in a manner as sympathetic as possible to the Voluntary system, straining the law and the administration of the code where they might press hardly on Voluntary schools.

Nevertheless the time came when, in spite of all these alleviations, the denominations, and especially the Established Church, found it impossible to maintain the struggle, and advantage was taken in 1902 of an exceptional majority won at an election where the Conservative party appealed on patriotic grounds for an exceptional and non-party support.

The result was the Education Act of 1902, making the maintenance of all schools a charge upon the rates, while leaving the effective management in the hands of bodies two-thirds of whom were the successors of the old denominational managers.

The one material duty left to private effort was that of main-

taining the schools in substantial repair. Even here at the last moment the House of Lords imposed on the public authorities the duty of making good so much of the wear and tear as was attributable to their use of the school building.

I pass over the obligation to make necessary structural alterations and improvements, for these ought long ago to have been demanded by the Board of Education, and even since the passing of the Act of 1902 the Board of Education has been singularly inert in condemning buildings, except where they were transferred to the public local authority. It has been too often said that legislation to amend the Act of 1902 was needed to meet the 'Nonconformist grievance.' There is, of course, a 'Nonconformist grievance,' but a far greater grievance is the citizen's grievance, the continuance of private management when the charge was transferred to the public funds. But, apart from this political grievance, there is the great educational objection, that our national system of popular education cannot make any great progress until it is frankly and completely put under public local management, and thus enlists the sympathy and appeals to the interest of the whole community.

There is no such vital force to promote and extend an efficient system of schools as giving responsibility and power to those who maintain them. In future the Board of Education itself will have to recede in the background, and while of course reserving its control over the Parliamentary grant and withholding the whole or a portion where the locality by its slackness fails to deserve it, will nevertheless have to leave much more freedom as to curricula, school organisation, &c., to the local authorities.

Thus, when the Act of 1902 placed the Voluntary schools on the rates and abolished every remnant of the conditions imposed in 1870 as necessary to their receiving public aid, it became clear that the nation would have as its next step to proceed frankly to the substitution of a municipal for an ecclesiastical basis for the public school system.

And when once the school system became municipal it was clear that ecclesiastical and theological tests on teachers must also disappear.

It might naturally seem to follow from this that the municipal system should be limited to secular teaching. The Bill did indeed provide that any distinctive or denominational teaching should be at the private cost of those who desired it, but it left the local authority free to give the general teaching commonly described by the name of Mr. Cowper-Temple.

This undoubtedly was a privilege conferred on general Bible teaching, and may be described as the permission to establish a municipal State Church in the elementary schools. It may also be argued that as the teachers are permitted to give this teaching and

the local authorities are permitted to pay for it, tests for teachers may be introduced indirectly in connection with this teaching.

At the earlier stages of this year's controversy there were some indications that the Anglican party intended to take up the line of logic and of religious equality. I have already referred elsewhere to the three sermons preached at St. Paul's by the Bishop of Stepney and reprinted in the *Guardian* and in the organ of the National Society, which advocated this course, and to the speeches of the Bishop of Manchester on the same lines. But reflection and contact with others apparently made the Church party realise the impolicy and unpopularity of this line of action, and, so far from attacking Cowper-Templeism, we have had an amendment put in the Bill, on the motion of Lord Heneage, providing (Clause I.) that no school shall be recognised as a public elementary school unless some portion of the school hours of every day is set apart for the purpose of religious instruction.

This amendment was adopted in preference to one from the Episcopal bench imposing the duty on the local authority of giving and inspecting this teaching, and it was advocated by some of the bishops on the ground that it did not pledge the House to Cowper-Temple teaching, but rather pointed to 'facilities.' But even if, as might be under the words of the clause, a free time were set apart with no public supply of religious teaching, even volunteers could in that time give nothing but Cowper-Temple teaching; and in fact the words, so far as they would be operative, could only in effect be a strong suggestion to local authorities to make universal what is now almost universal, some element of religious observances in a school. It must be borne in mind that the prohibition to the Board of Education to inspect any religious teaching would still remain in the unrepealed part of the Education Act, 1870. But the Bill still leaves every teacher free to give or not to give this religious instruction, and in Clause IX. (2) enacts that he shall not be required to subscribe to any religious creed or to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school or place of religious worship. These words are certainly inadequate; they fall far short of the words of the Act of 1902, enacted by Mr. Balfour's Government: 'Teachers may be appointed without reference to religious creed or denomination.'

They fall far short of the provisions in our more modern universities. Thus the Manchester University charter provides: 'It shall not be lawful for the court by any Statute or otherwise to adopt or impose on any person any test whatever of religious belief or profession in order to entitle him or her to be admitted as a professor, teacher, student, or member of the University.'

When Lord Goschen was helping to free the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and their colleges from tests, he was not afraid of using effective words, and I hope in any future Bill effective words

will be used, and not words which, as Mr. Balfour has repeatedly and truly pointed out, are quite insufficient for their purpose. Closely coupled with the abolition of tests for teachers is the question of their employment to give distinctive religious teaching.

It is strongly felt that, with a local authority friendly to the old denominational system, teachers who let it be known that they were willing to volunteer to give this teaching would obtain a preference. The Government actually offered to give way on this point for assistants in town schools and in certain other large schools. But the demand has been pressed for heads as well as assistants, and for rural as well as town schools.

If this had been conceded we should have run a serious risk of seeing re-established by underhand methods what was nominally being abolished. Indeed, Mr. Birrell has more than once said in substance that he would not be sorry to see something of the sort done in Roman Catholic and Jewish schools.

Lord St. Aldwyn actually carried an amendment on Clause IX. (3), which provides that, in schools enjoying extended facilities, the local authority shall consult the parents' committee, and shall satisfy themselves that the teachers appointed are qualified and willing to give the religious instruction for which the extended facilities are afforded. What is this but the imposition of a test on the teacher and the refusal of the liberty conferred by (2) of the same clause?

Lord Crewe, in his speech on the first consideration of the rejection by the House of Commons of the Lords' amendments, expressed the willingness of the Government to give a consultative voice to the parents' committee in Clause IV. Schools (schools entitled to special facilities for religious teaching), as to the selection of the teachers, but stated that the Government could not give a veto. Nevertheless, when the promises of the speech were translated into the drafts of amendments, many were surprised to find that he had granted the veto which he had said the Government would not give. The words of his amendment are :

> In every public elementary school in which extended facilities are afforded under this Act the local education authority shall appoint persons acceptable to the parents' committee to be teachers in the school, and for that purpose shall consult with the committee as to such appointment.

Thus the person suggested must be acceptable to the parents' committee, and they may refuse every nomination until the local authority submits the name they desire. This is going much further than Lord St. Aldwyn's amendment, already quoted, which was resisted by the Government. In some Roman Catholic schools staffed by nuns the managers raise objection to a lay Roman Catholic teacher or to a nun of a different teaching order. The local authority would, under the Bill so amended, be forced to accept any such school, though

not generally needed to subsidise the order by accepting its members as teachers, and to keep in repair the building for general denominational use.

Similarly in a Church of England school it would not be enough to appoint an Anglican teacher. The parents' committee might reject anyone who did not practise habitual confession, observe fast days, and generally conform to all the extreme practices which have been described before the late Ritual Commission.

That some recognition of the special character of Clause IV. schools may be necessary is probable, but Lord Crewe's amendment shows how terribly far the Government was prepared to go for the sake of a settlement—much farther than, let us hope, any Liberal Government will ever venture to go again.

Such proposals make the municipal school the vestibule to the church, and the proposal is the more intolerable since the local authority had not a free hand as to recognising or not recognising, accepting or not accepting, such schools.

The fact is that no consistent defence can be made for a scheme which, while recognising the municipal and neutral character of the public school, temporises with the ecclesiastical organisation which is passing away. Still, if the free municipal schools covered the whole country within reach of all, there might be some inconsistent indulgence shown for exceptional and clearly defined minorities. But unfortunately some of these minorities, so far from accepting gratefully what is offered, make the offer a pretext for demanding much more. We are told by the *Tablet* and by the Duke of Norfolk in the House of Lords that in Preston the Roman Catholic schools could not get the benefit of Clause IV. because there are no neutral schools accessible in the part of the town where they are situate. But clearly the Roman Catholics could quite easily cede one of their schools to the municipality and draft the non-Catholic children into them, and so fairly use the remainder.

The recent action of Sir Piers Mostyn at Talacre, as proved at the inquiry held by the Board of Education, the maintenance of a Roman Catholic school where ninety-five per cent. of the scholars are stated to be Protestant Nonconformists, the conversion of that school into a certified efficient school taught by nuns, and the serving of notices to quit on Nonconformist tenants whose children went to the Board school and not to the Roman Catholic school, show that the spirit to be encountered is not necessarily one of anxiety for the faith of those who are already members of a Church, but the insolence of territorial domination quite regardless of the wishes or beliefs of parents.

I am strongly of opinion that no Clause IV. school should be tolerated as entitled to rate aid unless at least three-fourths of the scholars actively demand such a school, and unless within an equally convenient

distance from the school population there is another public school with surplus accommodation, and which can be enlarged if need be; and it should also be the duty of the Board of Education, before sanctioning a Clause IV. school, to see that that margin of surplus accommodation is already in existence. It might well be that, while waiving the requirement of 5,000 population, a minimum population of 2,000 in the urban district or parish should be required. Another point has been much pressed on the Government in the House of Lords, namely, that when a local authority declines to take over a school, there should be some external authority, probably the Board of Education, which should be able to order the acceptance of the transfer.

This proposal was apparently half assented to in some modified form by the Government when Lord Crewe spoke of finding a halfway house between the right to refuse and the obligation to accept.

I can imagine no such halfway house, and in any case it seems to me a serious invasion of the rights of the Commons for the House of Lords to impose on the ratepayers, in any case, the obligation to take over a school which shall thereby become chargeable on the rates.

There are many reasons besides structural suitability and superfluity which may induce a local authority to refuse a school. The building may be one not absolutely unfit for occupation, and yet inconvenient, with little or no playground, and costly to keep up. There may be three schools of 200 each in a town where one school of 600 would be better for education and cheaper to maintain. Moreover, the Bill enables the owners of a transferred school to bargain with the local authority for the permanent giving of some specified form of religious teaching legal in a Council school. Thus the managers of the Church schools of Dorsetshire might bargain once for all that so long as these schools were transferred to the county, the diocesan syllabus of Bible teaching as varied from time to time should be permanently in force. The Board of Education has never hitherto allowed a transfer of a Voluntary school to contain stipulations which would interfere with the right of a School Board to regulate its own scheme of instruction.

The Bill as the House of Lords fashioned it contained the possibility of a coercive transfer, and by implication the incorporation of this condition as a term of the transfer. It is vital to the improvement of education that local authorities should have a free hand in the matter.

The Duke of Devonshire, in his amendment to Clause XI., proposed and carried that, in considering the propriety of enforcing a transfer, the commissioners should have regard to the wishes of the parents as to the religious instruction of their children.

Thus the ratepayers are to have a more expensive and worse educational organisation in order that a building may be maintained

at the public expense which is not otherwise needed, where parents may have their children taught their religion, and the Church organisation will also have its Sunday school kept in repair at the expense of the locality.

When Lord Crewe placed his amendments on the paper it appeared that he had failed to find a halfway house, and had been forced to travel the whole road to Chatsworth before he could find a resting place.

The operative words of Lord Crewe's amendment provide that under certain conditions the commissioners shall, unless they consider there are further grounds for refusing a transfer, order the local authority to continue the school offered them.

Practically it would be very rare for the school not to be taken over if the prescribed conditions are fulfilled. These are: (1) that the Board of Education must certify the school to be structurally suitable; (2) that the school is or is likely to be required for the purpose of providing a sufficient number of school places.

Now all these schools are at present public elementary schools, and therefore passed by the Board of Education as structurally suitable. Many of them are nevertheless extremely bad, as may be seen by the surveyor's reports made to various local authorities. But is it likely that the Board of Education will pass a vote of censure on itself by declaring that the schools which it is at the time of the Report recognising as structurally suitable are not structurally suitable? Again, Lord Crewe explained that the words 'the school is likely to be required' were inserted for the purpose of treating a possible growth of population hereafter as a reason for compelling a local authority at present to maintain an unnecessary school. The cost to the rates, the injury to education, would be very great if this tenderness to denominational claims were to stand in the way of the effective organisation of the school supply of a district. Far better, if a compromise is needed, to take the one suggested in Committee by Lord St. Aldwyn and provide that where the local authority refuse to take over a Voluntary school otherwise suitable on the ground that it is not needed, the two days' facilities may be granted in some other adjoining Council school, either by the act of the local authority or, if necessary, by the order of the Board of Education.

As a matter of fact the local authorities, from friendliness to denominational schools and from reluctance to incur expense, will far rather try and take over all the schools offered them than seek to build new ones. The real danger is not persecution of the Voluntary schools, but reluctance to spend money in the improvement of education in opposition to a section powerful if in a minority, and master of the situation if, as in many counties, they are in a majority.

Another point on which the Government was willing to give way was on the right of the parent to send his child to school only during

the period of secular teaching. As a matter of fact, in a small village school a child demanding the benefit of the conscience clause cannot, if present, receive any secular instruction. The staff are all engaged on the Bible teaching. The child cannot even be placed in a separate room. At best he may be set to do sums or to transcribe some passage on the same bench with the others who are receiving their Scripture lesson, and he therefore has all the appearance of a marked child in disgrace doing a punishment. This compulsion to attend school means in practice compulsion to receive the Bible lesson, and is really an indirect attempt to make religious teaching compulsory. Even in town schools it is almost impossible to organise separate secular instruction for scholars withdrawn. I have seen the attempt made in good faith and have seen it break down.

The Bill of 1906 had a proposal for the distribution of 1,000,000*l.* a year, some of which would have gone in rent, much of it in repairs of dilapidated school buildings. It is to be hoped that this million will go hereafter to what would be really to the advantage of education—the replacing of bad, worn out, obsolete Voluntary schools by new well-planned Council schools.

In 1887, nearly twenty years ago, Viscount Cross's Commission of strongly Conservative character recommended that the time had come when a higher standard should be enforced in regard to school accommodation and planning.

It certainly is high time now that every elementary school should be required to satisfy the rules of planning of the department, and notice should be given as soon as possible that this necessary improvement of existing schools should be a condition of recognition.

At least ten square feet per scholar, proper lighting and ventilation, proper sized class-rooms, proper cloak-rooms, lavatories and offices, proper playground : all these should be demanded, and managers might be required within six months to show that contracts had been signed and the work was in hand. As probably many schools would thereby be discontinued and a heavy strain would be thrown on local authorities, they might well be offered a subsidy of four-fifths of their loan and sinking fund to enable them to meet the charge. The 1,000,000*l.* offered by the Bill of 1906 would cover an expenditure of 20,000,000*l.*, leaving 5,000,000*l.* at the charge of the localities ; but the substitution of good new schools of reasonable size and with properly arranged class-rooms would probably lead to a saving of yearly cost quite equal to the interest and sinking fund on that 5,000,000*l.*, besides ensuring a great increase in efficiency, and far healthier and pleasanter conditions of work for teachers and scholars. The provision of halls and proper playgrounds in our towns would do much for the physical development of our population.

As to the Voluntary schools which should be found satisfactory and fit to take over, I cannot admit the propriety of paying any

rent for buildings held in trust for education. The managers under the Act of 1870 have power to disregard any provision of their trust which prevents them complying with the code conditions for annual grants. They have also power to transfer their schools, and the Board of Education never allowed a rent to be paid for premises held in trust.

I do not believe there are many parishes where the population would tolerate a Church school standing empty if fit for use while they were rated to pay three-fourths of the cost of a new school. The old managers would get the building kept in repair for them for Sunday school and parochial use. They would also have the right of access twice a week for special teaching, which is oftener than they generally used it formerly. In short, the Board of Education in the Bill of 1906 offered inducements which were contrary to their former practice, and in my opinion quite unnecessary when the transition is being made to a national system.

When we turn from the controversial parts of the Bill, which are connected with ecclesiastical struggles for supremacy, we may ask, Is there anything in the Bill which promotes education?

I would answer, that as the clearing away of the jungle must precede cultivation, so the establishment of a consistent municipal system is a necessary preliminary to effective education. But not till we reach Clause 20 and Part II. of the Bill do we get out of the controversial atmosphere.

Section 20 is a well-meaning attempt to improve on the excessive centralisation over wide rural areas of the Act of 1902. In my opinion it does not do enough, and until we have, at any rate in the large towns, educational authorities separate from and independent of the ordinary municipal authorities, we shall not get an adequate supply of local interest in education. But Section 20 represents a considerable amount of thoughtful agreement, and is worth having as far as it goes, though that is not very far.

Section 21 is good, and so is Section 24, but it is a pity that the unnecessary intrusion of the Local Government Board into the approval of loans for educational purposes has not been repealed, and that the Education Department is not reinstated in its sole action.

Section 31 contains many interesting provisions, and subsection (*b*), as to medical arrangements, would probably prove of very great advantage; subsection (*c*) also restores a valuable power of aiding scholars by bursaries in elementary schools, which was, I think, inadvertently repealed in 1902. It is a pity that the right of retaining scholars up to sixteen in the elementary school, without requiring the special consent of the Board of Education, has not been granted. There can be no proper organisation of higher elementary schools without this concession of an extra year.

How the present Government will deal with the education question

is for them to decide. Much may be done. Much should be done by resolute administration, but the forces which carried the Education Bill through the Commons, the unprecedented vote which rejected the Lords' Amendments by nearly four to one, show that within a very short time national education must be taken entirely out of the hands of ecclesiastical bodies and made definitely and completely a part of the lay municipal activities of the nation.

Justice requires that all should have equal treatment. If the denominations protest against the admission of any municipal Bible teaching, they have a right to oppose the principle of a State Church applied to the communal school, and Liberals should be glad to take them at their word and get rid of all State Churches, whether for the whole nation and for all ages or limited to children in the day schools. But if Anglicans really desire Bible teaching to go on, there is no political reason why the State should not continue neutral, as before, and the local authorities have the same discretion that they now have.

In any case the experience of this Session has not been entirely wasted.

The Government may realise how impolitic it is to begin by offering all the concessions and departures from principle which they might perhaps have contemplated as possible while the Bill was going through Parliament. Every party will always try to get more than has been offered to it in the first instance.

Members of the Government may remember another time that it is quite as important in their speeches to conciliate their own side as the other, and that assurances to deputations, inconsistent with the text of the Bill, are not only embarrassing to the speaker, but seriously inconvenient to the loyal supporters of the Bill. It is improbable that we shall see an Education Bill in 1907; but the question cannot go over to another Parliament. Meantime Liberals may fairly expect that those great administrative powers which the department wields shall be so used, that Parliamentary aid, which is exclusively the affair of the Commons, shall be so granted as to give effect to the policy affirmed by an overwhelming majority of that House.

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY.

ENTENTE—ENGLISH OR GERMAN?

ALLIANCES between nations to be durable should be founded on recognised interests and not upon vague sentimentality. It is this conviction which leads me to examine the Anglo-French *entente cordiale* from the strict point of view of French interests in an English Review. The subject has been fully discussed in French periodicals from the French and in England from the English point of view. But it seems to me that it would be useful to look at the matter from a different angle, and to examine it in France from the English and in England from the French side. I am not qualified to undertake the former task, but with regard to the second I believe that, in a certain degree, I am in a position to submit the question to the readers of this Review.

At the outset, it is important to make clear to the English that it is the aim and intention of the French to strengthen unremittingly and in every way the bonds already existing between the two countries. In this way only will it be possible to create the confidence that a continuance of the present relations rests upon a basis more solid than a sentimental, and therefore only fleeting, enthusiasm. The same result will follow in France, when the English shall have carefully summed up and declared the practical reasons which induce them to draw closer to France. They will in this way convince the French of the reality and stability of their feelings. In a word, from the moment that each nation realises with complete consciousness the urgent motives which are bringing them together, all doubt and doubt-dealing will vanish; the *entente* will acquire the character of an immovable alliance because, based upon a conformity of aim, and of material interests—such as binds together communities and nations—it will have reached its standpoint by natural evolution.

In France at the present time the drift towards Great Britain is real and sincere. It is doubtless more placid and self-restrained than was the outburst of enthusiasm for the Franco-Russian alliance, which lasted from 1892 to 1897 or 1898. It has, moreover, many opponents, whilst, so far as my recollection serves me, the Russian alliance aroused none. Nevertheless, at the present time the Franco-Russian alliance, although like the Triplice still figuring in diplomatic

language, is now little more than a memory. Will this happen to the *entente cordiale*, which at this moment is forcing France and England into one another's arms? What guarantee is there that it will be more secure? Will it last the longer because, less impulsive and more contested at its outset, it has imposed itself as inevitable in view of the requirements of the two nations?

It is this last solution which the writer believes to be correct, and he accepts it with joy. In 1897 he anticipated the present state of opinion and advocated in an English newspaper the then unborn *entente*. He is eager in defending it to-day, because he sees in it a necessity for the civilisation of the world; and he welcomes its discussion in the belief that alliances are made durable and profitable in so far as their conditions are the outcome of reflection and debate, not merely of passion or sentiment.

In France—it is useless to deny the fact—the *entente* is still a matter of debate. It is supported by the majority of the nation, but there is undoubtedly a minority opposed to the results achieved by the statesmen, traders, and manufacturers of the two countries. This hostility can be traced to two distinct sources.

Amongst its supporters—and the author is at one with these—the dominating idea is the preservation of peace; and of this they hold that in the present state of European politics an Anglo-French understanding affords the best guarantee. In their view war would bring with it consequences as terrible to the victor as to the vanquished; it would revive the embers of national hatred, a narrow spirit of patriotism, and would give fresh impetus to militarism—in a word, to all that is opposed to human progress. They hold, moreover, that even the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine would but poorly compensate for the moral damage which would result therefrom.

The English alliance, moreover, appears to its French supporters not only as the best guarantee of the peace of Europe, but at the same time a powerful help to the cause of freedom. By drawing into their orbit—as neither nation could do separately—Italy and Spain, and supported by the United States, France and England acting in harmony would be able to counterbalance the surviving military despotisms of Europe. Their influence would of necessity increase, and they would thus day by day become more and more active factors in the progress of civilisation. It goes without saying that if the alliance with England was aimed at another nation, if, instead of having for its object the consolidation of peace, it aimed at stirring up bellicose feelings and getting ready for war, its French partisans would have rejected it with as much decision as they showed in welcoming it as a message of peace.

At the same time it must be admitted that there are numbers of Frenchmen who are sceptical of the pacific intentions of the English, and seem to see in the drawing together of our two countries a source

of future conflicts. On this ground, as will be shown later on, a number of my countrymen favour the idea of an *entente continentale*. Such an hypothesis, however, is scarcely even plausible, especially since the advent to power of a Liberal ministry in England. The pacific character of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman's cabinet, his bold declarations in favour of disarmament, supported by the indisputable wisdom of King Edward, are pledges which should convince the most stubborn to advance boldly in the path of Anglo-French accord. It must, however, be borne in mind that to preserve peace both parties must be agreed, and that war will sometimes break out notwithstanding the efforts of men, and even of nations, to prevent this deplorable calamity.

It may be taken for granted that at the present moment nobody is systematically aiming at bringing about a European conflagration. Anxious not to calumniate any one, we should refrain from suspecting any such designs on the part of the German Emperor, notwithstanding his haughty tone and his repeated appeals to force. We are, however, altogether in the dark with regard to what may be his secret thoughts, which lie hidden from all: but it is within our right and even our duty to ask ourselves which road points to safety in case of an inevitable conflict which we had done our utmost to avoid. If the ill-chance should once again force the cannon to speak, on which side would self-interest urge France to range her forces? Should the French army and navy unite with those of England, or with those of Germany?

If it could be shown that it was a matter of vital moment that France should ally herself with Germany, it is obvious that, even if peace were preserved, the *entente cordiale* must of necessity come to an end.

Now the partisans of an understanding with Germany, after refusing to recognise in the friendship of England any guarantee for the peace of Europe, assert that in the event of war our country, to avoid annihilation, would be forced to make common cause with the Continental Powers. This is the second ground for their opposition to any understanding with Great Britain—finding in it first a cause of conflict—and in the conflict a cause of defeat and ruin for France. It is principally among the Nationalists that these objections are raised. The Republicans, the Radicals, the Radical Socialists and the 'peace-mongering bourgeois' are so absolutely opposed to war in any way, that for the most part they refuse to face such an eventuality. One would be tempted to apply to them the German proverb concerning those who 'see the wolf which others draw upon the wall'—they dare not speak of it for fear of bringing it to life. But once this hypothesis put aside, they are ready to fraternise with the British without reserve, recognising that our interest, except in the event of a possible war, cannot in any way be questioned.

The Nationalists are divided into two camps—the one—and it must be said the more numerous, holding for England. The Nationalists and Conservatives, although at variance on many points, at the present time form an anti-ministerial '*bloc*'—an *antibloc*—and of their organs in the Press, *L'Echo de Paris*, *La Liberté*, and *Le Gaulois* stand up for England. In like manner in the Chamber the Nationalist deputies, MM. Cochin, Delafosse, Castellane, and their adherents are very English, in fact more English than those on the Government side, for they supported to the last the policy of M. Delcassé, which the advanced party condemned as strongly in the Chamber as in the provinces. The same may be said of M. Déroulède and of the majority of the Progressists who range themselves round M. Ribot. On the other hand, another fraction of the Nationalist party of which *L' Éclair*, with M. Judet at its head, is the accredited organ, appears to lean towards a *rapprochement* with Germany.

When recently discussing the situation with a friend, a Nationalist of broad and definite views—M. Léouzon Le Duc (who permits me to mention him by name)—I asked him the meaning of the *volte-face* of his party. He replied with frankness and precision, as he was the more able to do having taken no decided part in the matter. He explained to me the reasons against the Anglo-French *entente* which prevail in the 'German' group of the Nationalists. In using this term, I have no thought of saying anything polemical, but merely to distinguish it from the 'English' group.

The German group includes certainly the most Conservative and most reactionary members of the Nationalist party. Its leaders were the loudest in their welcome of the Franco-Russian alliance, in which they saw a guarantee of strength for a long time, and drew from it the hope of the military *revanche*, the object of their inner aspirations. But above all they were drawn towards it by the fact that the Czar is an autocrat, and therefrom they anticipated a recoil on the part of the French Government towards the reactionary ideas of the Russian nobility.

It is not my intention to discuss here the Russian alliance, which would lead me away from my subject; but, whether or not it has been beneficial to French policy, it is beyond doubt that during many years successive Cabinets in France have been influenced by the fear that the *sacrosanct* alliance would be jeopardised if anything were done to displease the Czar. One has only to refer to the recently published Memoirs of General André for an instance; but this will be probably the last to be recorded.

The Russian alliance was leading us directly to a continental *entente* against England—that is, to an alliance with Germany. It took us to Kiel, and subsequently, in the Chinese expedition, it led us to place our forces under the command of General von Waldersee. Conservatives of every shade took no umbrage. The alliance, when

the Czar *honoured* us with his presence, gave them the opportunity of shouting 'Vive l'Empereur' in the streets and theatres of Paris—and that was all they wanted.

The English alliance presents the opposite effect. Should the Conservatives return to power—of which there seems little likelihood at present—Great Britain would still remain the home of freedom. She is undoubtedly attached to her old monarchy, where the King is careful not to depart from his duty to the Constitution, and exercises his influence solely by persuasion. England, as an English statesman once expressed it, is a 'crowned republic,' and as such has no motive to hamper or grudge the expansion of the republic in France. In point of fact she prefers a republican to a monarchical government in France, knowing that the latter must necessarily be retrograde. And by reason of the *entente cordiale*, and by that influence which friendly nations without any pressure exercise upon one another, it is fully realised on this side of the Channel that the sympathies of the British Government would never in any way be in favour of a reactionary party. The understanding with England consequently gives to French politicians of the past no external support to their reactionary hopes, and this consideration alone would be sufficient to keep them aloof from it.

This is, however, not the position taken by M. Léouzon Le Duc. In the actual state of affairs, without being what I should call a Republican 'in principle,' he holds strongly for the republican form of government in France. He is frankly hostile to anything in the shape of a Restoration, for various reasons—chiefly because he does not believe it would be durable, and because he recognises that it would lead to fresh troubles and further revolutions.

This view, however, is not shared by the more ardent members of his party; and the monarchical sentiments, by which they are inspired, constitute their main objection to an alliance with England, and draw them towards a union with Germany. It is only fair, however, to recognise that these are not their only motives; and possibly that many amongst them are even unconscious of them. For the greater number, as I have already said, the fear is that the *entente cordiale* is a provocative of war rather than a guarantee of peace, and that even with the support of England it would be impossible to withstand an invasion by Germany.

On this point, it is as well to cite M. Léouzon Le Duc's own words:

> In 1897 when the Franco-Russian accord was at its full strength and France possessed a new artillery unequalled on the other side of the Rhine, the Nationalists (of the 'German' group) looked upon a continental war as a big venture. To-day the venture would be fraught with far greater risk. On the one hand military feeling in our country is on the wane, desertions are feared the reserves are undisciplined, and there is a want of confidence in the commanding officers. It is dangerous, when war is contemplated, to prepare for it with anti-military teachers in power. At the same time, Russia could not give

the same reply now to an appeal for help as she could then. Moreover the co-operation of England even with the support of Japan gives France no assurance of success. England might despatch 100,000 men five days after the declaration of war. To wait for Japan, supposing that the Anglo-Japanese Treaty brought with it for us the support of those Asiatics, would be a matter of months—their support moreover might hasten or facilitate the addition of French Indo-China to the empire of the Rising Sun. But the conflict in Europe would have been decided after three or four battles—and a comparison between the French and German forces is in favour of the latter. Unity of command, the Emperor, the actual numbers in the field, and military sentiment are so many factors of victory. In a word my friends are afraid of a reverse—and this inclines them towards the policy inaugurated by Hanotaux rather than to that of Déroulède and his friends. Clemenceau, big with war-thoughts, wishes to take the direction of military affairs.[1] His first object doubtless is to raise the tone of the army by appeals to the traditions of the Revolution. The Jacobin spirit in him has clung to these traditions, as it has to the doctrine of individual ownership, as shown in his recent dispute with Jaurès. How far he may be successful is a matter of speculation. Hitherto his methods have been destructive: he must now show himself capable of a constructive policy. The task is paradoxical, but Clemenceau will do his best, and not the less so because England, at the proper moment, will insist upon it. His hands are not free—*he is bound by a military convention recently signed without the knowledge of his party—as in the case, years ago, of the Russian alliance.* The terms of the convention are known only to a few—but there is no doubt as to their having been settled.

M. Léouzon Le Duc, although swayed by this argument, based on our military inferiority, put forward by the 'German' group, was nevertheless undecided. On the whole he was inclined to accept it for the following reasons:

First, making allowance for their pessimism, I do not shut my ears to their teaching—and I admit that the chances of war are full of peril. Secondly, should the war end disastrously, a restoration of the monarchy, engineered by William the Second, will ensue. The trend of his mind is directly opposed to that of Bismarck, who, as an uncompromising monarchist, fully believed that a republic would be a source of weakness for France; and in 1872 went so far as to do all in his power to prevent a restoration. William the Second, on the other hand, like the Emperor of Austria, is faithful to the traditions of the Holy Alliance (a matter on which I could give you some strange evidence). I am by no means desirous of seeing such a solution—which I look upon as the immediate consequence of the defeat of our armies. The third, and most weighty, I call the overflow argument. The policy of the English alliance bars against Germany the world-routes which British Imperialism with our assistance keeps for itself. But Germany is a country of a surplus population. An outlet for emigrants is essential to her well-being. If the oversea countries are closed against her, she will end by having a population so dense that it will overflow her borders, and encroach upon the neighbouring territories. Before long that pacific penetration will not meet the needs of the outflow, and, as in the fourth century, the Germans will seek to settle themselves by force within our borders. Bismarck foresaw this eventuality. He wished Germany to remain

[1] This was written before M. Sarrien's retirement. But the view is strengthened by subsequent events, as M. Clemenceau, indirectly it is true, has taken into his own hands the management of military policy.

a nation in arms; he opposed for the like reason all ideas of colonial enterprise. It follows therefore that it is in our interest to promote German colonisation. M. Hanotaux's policy favoured this movement—that of Edward the Seventh is opposed to it: and for this reason I do not think it desirable. The expansion of German Imperialism or Pan-Germanism is for us a pledge of peace; whilst British Imperialism acting in opposition to it is for us a source of danger. My conclusion is that it would be more advantageous for us by means of a friendly exchange of colonies to obtain from Germany the restoration of our lost provinces in Europe.

In the present stage of the debate on the respective advantages of the English and the Continental *ententes* these arguments in favour of the latter seem to me to carry the greater weight, unless you have on your side arguments which countervail.

Among the reasons which you have so far put forward in favour of an Anglo-French agreement, there is one which I admit merits respectful consideration. In your eyes this agreement is the best guarantee of European peace for two distinct reasons. First, it tends to isolate Germany, and in fact has already almost done so. The Triplice itself has given way under the strain. Moreover British diplomacy is admirably conducted, and King Edward the Seventh shows himself a man of genius, comparable with Bismarck himself. Germany thus isolated will hesitate before putting her armies in motion against a coalition of the nations of Europe. In the second place, since 1870 the economic laws of the German Empire have undergone complete change. You are aware of the enormous extension of German industry in every market of the world; and the marvellous expansion of her mercantile navy. In the event of war this navy would disappear or be swept away, and consequently Germany would refrain from embarking upon a struggle from which she would emerge financially ruined. The *entente cordiale* would thus constrain Germany to respect the world's peace.

At first sight the argument seems conclusive, but in reality it is not so. A counter argument has been brought to refute it. To protect her commercial marine Germany has been busy constructing and arming a navy—which is to be completed by 1915. The policy of England, therefore, would be to hasten events, to anticipate the crisis and to put a stop to the carrying out of the German naval programme by every means in her power. The *entente cordiale* will furnish the means, and this agreement, so far from being a guarantee of peace, will be the source of the next war—because it will enable England to undertake it at her own time and pleasure.

These arguments neutralise one another. I shall therefore be glad to hear what on your side you have to say to justify the price to be paid by France for the *entente cordiale*. You say that the Russian alliance has cost us ten milliards, and that that is too much. I hold that the *entente cordiale* has cost us still more; for we have paid for it by giving up our rights in Egypt and Newfoundland.

Such are the party views on this question, but, as I said before, I have no decided opinion on the point, and I am ready to be convinced by the arguments which seem to me most solid.

I have been careful to use my interlocutor's own words in order that I may not be open to the suspicion of having misstated his line of argument. In M. Léouzon Le Duc I find an opponent who, as much by clearness and precision of expression as by the impartiality of his mind, is in every way fitted to support his views in good faith and by straightforward reasoning, without appealing to passion

or taking refuge in subterfuge. Moreover, he has been at pains to learn the real grounds on which the more serious members of the 'German' group base their arguments.

In the first place, it is a matter of surprise that the pessimistic note should be sounded by the Nationalists. Ever since 1871 they have persistently been beating the war-drum. They have been unceasing in their denunciation of the Treaty of Frankfort, and in keeping at fever-point the hostility of French and Germans. They have daily repeated that the only way by which France can resume her position in Europe is by the recovery by arms of her two lost provinces. Now, however, a fraction of the same party, and that, although the least numerous, still the most active, is to-day inciting us to come to a Continental agreement with our enemy of yesterday, and endeavours to turn against England that hatred of Germany which up to the present the more progressive portion of the nation has strongly reprehended. Even supposing that they had at last found grace, one must admit that the spectacle they present is far from edifying. However, it is easy to believe what we desire, and it may be quite delightful for the impenitent enemies of our form of government to exalt an ideal all the more because they are abandoning it, and to assert that their reason for so acting is that the Republic has broken up the national defences.

It is needless to dwell upon this change of attitude—it is sufficient to recognise the right of the Nationalists to learn wisdom, and to examine the grounds of their argument. They amount after all to very little. The *entente cordiale* in their opinion involves the chance of being a cause of war instead of a guarantee of peace, and since our forces are not in a state to hold their own on land against the forces of Germany, it leads to defeat, and to our ultimate ruin. To these fears, according to M. Léouzon Le Duc, there is the further danger, in the event of defeat, of a monarchical restoration, which doubtless on the other hand would be some compensation to its partisans. This, however, is a secondary consideration. If France were capable of the blunder of voluntarily entering upon or of being forced into a war, and if success favoured our German rivals, the Republican as well as the Socialist ideal would not be wiped out in Europe; and what happened in France would be of no importance, for France would have ceased to exist politically. Hatred of war would be inculcated and fostered; and if those who in the past have been so ready to flourish their swords were to adopt views more in conformity with the spirit of human progress, it would be a matter for congratulation. In fact the outcome of all these arguments put forward by the opponents of the *entente cordiale* is that, in spite of it or by reason of it, a war might break out, and that it would result in a frightful catastrophe.

I accept this conclusion, with one restriction, for whilst the

Nationalists assert that the dangers would arise by reason of the *entente*, I maintain that they would arise in spite of it.

What is the conclusion to be drawn? It is that peace must be maintained even at the cost of the greatest sacrifices. My own views on this point are well known. They have drawn upon me attacks from one side, encouragement from the other. I have urged, and still urge, France to disarmament—even *unilateral*—should she be unable to bring about simultaneous action among the nations of Europe.

In these days, I do not believe it to be possible to induce any nation, Germany or another, to attack an inoffensive and disarmed nation, which by its own act had thus given the greatest example in the history of the world. I hold the dangers arising from such an attitude to be infinitely less than those which Europe now runs from an armed peace. I do not hide from myself, any more than the Nationalists, the peril overhanging Europe, but the study of history has taught me that the possession of imposing military strength often excites a nation to enterprises which it would otherwise have avoided.

Let us suppose France disarmed. Enlightened Germans and English would undoubtedly attach great importance to her friendship from an economic and intellectual point of view; but the statesmen of both countries would cease to seek her alliance, since it could give no help to their ambitions. No one would be able any longer to say to us, as Germany almost said recently, 'Be with us or against us.'

Such are my own convictions, and I have no power to force them upon others. The *bourgeois* will have none of them, and the Socialists who follow M. Hervé reject them equally as tinged with moderation and bourgeoisism. The latter declare themselves to be equally indifferent to both Germany and France, and maintain that in the event of any act of aggression we should not attempt to defend ourselves against the invaders, but should turn our arms against the enemies at home, the *bourgeois* and the capitalist—in a word, to achieve the social revolution; for in presence of a victorious and feudal enemy such a revolution would be within the range of possibility.

Such vapourings must be put aside. We must look at things, political and social, as they are, and consider the question in its actual surroundings. We have an army, and the Chambers are not likely to disband it; and although it daily becomes more unlikely and more difficult to kindle, still the danger of an international conflagration is within the range of possibility.

The question of alliances for us may be thus briefly summed up:

(1) As between the two possible alliances, which of them most puts aside the danger of war?

(2) Should a war break out, in spite of all attempts to prevent it,

which alliance offers the better chance of success, and involves the greater probability of defeat ?

(3) Which is the alliance which, supposing peace to be maintained, best harmonises with our democratic sentiments : and in the event of a successful war would assure us after victory the more advantageous position ?

And lastly (4) which is that which in time of peace is the more favourable to our economic development, and in the event of defeat would leave us least weakened ?

With regard to the first question, M. Léouzon has already shown the interest of the British Government to precipitate the struggle before the completion of the German naval programme. At the same time he admits that if the British Government is animated by no warlike views, its diplomacy is a trustworthy element of peace. He places these two considerations in the balance and finds them of equal weight. Moreover, he admits that both alliances offer similar dangers and similar guarantees.

His views might have found some support so long as the Conservative Government was in office in England, but since the advent to power of the Liberals the situation has changed. M. Léouzon's inference that the constantly increasing German population demands a colonial outlet is more important : for should England check it, Germany would seek compensation in Europe, and could find it only in France—and that by war. This second consideration is of even less weight in my mind. In the first place, the increase of population in Germany already shows signs of slackening. In Berlin now the birth-rate is scarcely higher than that of Paris. The German capital comes next after the French, and with a very small difference. So far this tendency has not spread to the country districts, but it will do so. Such movements once started in the large cities invariably spread to the more sparsely populated country districts. This is a law which nothing can reverse. Moreover, were it the fact that Germany would still need new outlets for the excess of her population, pacific penetration in France, in South America, and in the English colonies, open to trade with everybody, would suffice. At any rate this method would meet her requirements quite as well as forcible occupation, and she would be in no better position if she had seized upon neighbouring territory at the point of the sword. In bygone days, it is true, this latter was the way of solving the question. The vanquished were carried away into slavery and their lands divided among the victors. Although disgraceful confiscations, recalling ancient ways, are still, to the shame of civilised nations, winked at when dealing with barbarous tribes, it would be impossible to apply them in the case of those countries where modern civilisation, as we call it, reigns. In 1871 the Germans did not confiscate the cotton-mills of the Alsatians nor the farms of the Lorrainers, nor would the

French, had the fortune of war leant to their side, have dealt otherwise with German private property.

The argument, therefore, that the Anglo-French *entente* might provoke a war by forcing Germany to let loose her surplus population on France, it seems to me, may be safely disregarded.

Added to this, and supposing M. Léouzon Le Duc's conjecture to be realised, however contrary it seems to probability, namely that if the majority of the English people, instead of uniting with us in our efforts to avoid a war, were to do their utmost to provoke it, nothing would oblige us to follow their lead. Between an *entente cordiale*, or even between a defensive alliance and an offensive alliance, there is a vast gulf; and from our point of view France should keep aloof from any such entanglement with any Power as is implied by the last named. On no account should she bind her hands and consent to a state of things which at any moment might force her, in spite of herself, to take part in the confusion of arms.

It is therefore altogether unfair to say that in the *entente cordiale* there lurks the danger of our being drawn into war. At any rate it removes us one degree further away from it than would a Continental *entente*, and leaves our hands more free. With Germany as our ally, we should find at some critical moment that she was possessed of means of constraining us in a way that England never could do.

The other argument put forward by the Nationalists is that our army would be unable to hold its own against that of Germany on account of our inferiority in point of numbers, of unity of command, and the anti-military tendency, still undeveloped among our neighbours. This ground, as I have already said, may be a solid one for such as insist upon peace as a necessity, but it is valueless as against the *entente cordiale*. To give it weight it must be supposed that any agreement with one nation implied a cause of war with another, and that in the event of our taking the German side we were certain beforehand that we should be on the side of the victors. The Nationalists of the 'German' group do not seem to have regarded this eventuality. They have omitted to discuss the probable results in the case of victory or in that of defeat, in the event of a struggle between the Continental and the maritime Powers—they seem to assume that in such a war we should be inevitably the victors. This may be possibly the case, although my friends do not share in the belief that the British fleet will be swept aside by that of the Continental Powers combined, and British soil invaded by their troops. Nevertheless it is an hypothesis not the less tenable because its realisation seems to one absurd. The fleets of the United States and of Japan would in such case join forces with those of Great Britain; and it seems scarcely probable that the united fleets of all the Continental Powers all together—if a coalition could be arrived at—would be able to hold the seas.

Let us however examine the matter from both sides, looking at

victory as a mere cast of the dice, in which both contending players have an equal chance. What would happen to France in one and the other cases?

The victory of the British fleet would carry with it the destruction of our navy, the bombardment of our ports, the loss of our colonies—including Algiers and Tunis—of our shipping and of our export trade. On the other supposition, that of the defeat of the British, should we not find ourselves in a still worse plight? By ruining England, her best customer, France would absolutely ruin herself. Neither Germany nor Russia can absorb annually the 1,500 millions of French products which Great Britain buys from her. There is no industrial competition between the two countries—one is the complement of the other. The riches of the one increase the wealth of the other. Germany competes with us as she competes with England, so that we may look long and in vain for any advantages to our commerce from exchange with her.

There is another point of view to be considered. The victory of a Franco-German coalition would be scarcely less disastrous to the political than to the economic destinies of France. In view of the small ratio of the French population to those of Germany and Russia, we should become practically vassals of the northern empires. If this is not already our condition, it is due to the admirable counterpoise of Great Britain, of which the value made itself felt recently at the Conference of Algeciras. Were this makeweight to disappear, there is nothing left to us in Europe on which we could rely. Russia—Czar-ruled—finding it no longer possible to extract money from France, financially weakened by the collapse of the United Kingdom, would throw herself into the arms of Germany—of which the form of government and class privileges attract her sympathetically—and France would be left severely alone in the world of European politics. Yet M. Léouzon Le Duc, who dreads a monarchical restoration engineered by William the Second in the event of the defeat of the French armies, flatters himself that such an eventuality is not on the cards in the case of a successful campaign! A rude awakening would be in store for him.

The Emperor William the Second, we are assured, looks with disfavour on the Republic in France. He sees in it a bad example to his own people and a disturbing cause of which he would gladly get rid. He is imbued with the instincts of feudalism and at heart sympathises with the Middle Ages. This dislike of an anti-clerical France, tending towards Socialism, would not be lessened because with her aid he had beaten England. More probably it would be a further incentive to humiliate us. He would treat us as his grandfather treated Austria after having combined with her to despoil Denmark. The events in Morocco are sufficiently recent to remind us that the Kaiser has no scruples in picking a quarrel whenever he thinks it to his interest.

It is well known that during the heyday of the Russian alliance the Czar's Government on several occasions interfered in our home politics. It would be far worse when we found ourselves face to face with the victorious northern empires. They would take no more account of any assistance we may have given to bring about the result than Russia in 1876 gave to Roumania for her share in the campaign against Turkey, although without her aid it might have ended otherwise. We should have to bend the Republic before the Teuton bâton, or we should find ourselves in presence of a *querelle d'Allemand* which would lead to war and our inevitable defeat.

To accede to the Continental *entente* in order to avoid war would be in a way to apply the proverb, *reculer pour mieux sauter*. In point of fact, it would be a sure way to make that conflict certain and probably far more redoubtable. In face of such an alternative, there should be no hesitation. If the issue is in any case inevitable, it would be far wiser to try conclusions at once while the conditions are relatively favourable. A policy based on postponing in the hope of avoiding the day of reckoning may often be as fatal in diplomacy as in medicine.

Either peace *can* be maintained—and that is the supreme good—or the autocratic governments will force on war. For this there are intelligible grounds. Year by year the tide of democracy gathers strength and volume, and should it spread beyond national boundaries a rupture between neighbouring nations would become impossible. To arrest this movement, autocratic rulers may resort to the methods of the past. If peace be possible, it can be all the better assured if we find cordial and weighty support in the English people. If, on the other hand, the emperors in coalition insist upon war, and retain sufficient authority to impose their will upon their subjects, and force us to take up arms, even then, I maintain, it is better for us to have for our companions our friends across the Channel than the feudal Germans. To begin by strengthening the hand of the most determined opponent of democracy, the German Emperor (I do not refer to the German people), in order to furnish him with the means of crushing us more completely later on, would be the most fatuous policy.

Just as the Nationalists avoid discussing the chances of success which we might have in fighting Germany with England at our side, so they are unnecessarily pessimistic when they consider that France would be unable to hold her own for four months against invaders from across the Rhine. The Nationalists, however, maintain that 100,000 British troops landed in France would be of no avail. They forget that the British are excellent soldiers, even if not always scientifically led, and that it was they who gained Waterloo by their firmness and discipline. They forget also the moral influence of such co-operation on our own troops, an influence which might be translated into an

earnest of victory. They forget, too, that there is already between Great Britain and Japan an offensive and defensive alliance, by virtue of which we could claim the co-operation of the latter, and if need be, could strengthen it by the cession of our colonies in the extreme East to the Nippon Government. The Nationalists retort that the Japanese troops could not arrive in less than four months, by which time, and after three or four terrific engagements, we should have been completely crushed. These ardent patriots seem to me to hesitate little in slandering their country. It needs two generals to bring about a general battle—one to offer and the other to accept. Fabius Cunctator is still held in honour. The French army could almost indefinitely put off fighting a decisive battle, ever drawing the Germans further away from their base. In 1871, with an army unprovisioned, after repeated reverses, without arms and without an authorised Government, France held out as long as Paris was able to resist. Now, by the new system of fortifications, which prevents the complete investment of the capital, Paris could hold out far longer—and with Paris the rest of the country. Meanwhile our Asiatic allies will have had time to arrive: and we should then expect to see revived in our favour the policy which in 1808 Wellington adopted in the Peninsula, of giving the Spanish time to rally against us—and by the Germans in 1812 after the burning of Moscow. Moreover the bombardment of the German ports and arsenals and the destruction of German shipping must not be left out of account. From what precedes I therefore conclude that a cordial Anglo-French alliance is the best guarantee of peace, because it holds in check the power of Germany, because the English ministry is pacific, and lastly because it leaves our hands free, whilst Germany might at any moment force upon us a rupture and invade our territory if we refused to put our troops into line with hers.

The Anglo-French agreement, moreover, in the possible though improbable event of war breaking out in spite of us, offers as good chance of success as the German alliance. It further assures us too, in the event of success, an independent position subsequently, while victory with Germany would be the prelude to our political subordination and vassalage, of reaction and ultimate extinction—and financially it would be the beginning of bankruptcy.

In my mind, therefore, there is no ground for hesitancy: every Frenchman, Republican or Socialist, should support the alliance with England.

It is obvious, however, that in the event of anything unexpected, such as a Russian or a German revolution, or the collapse of the social fabric based on capitalism, a new order of things would arise: and the foregoing considerations would be swept away like everything else. There would then be no call for treaties of alliance, for there would be no longer separate, distinct and independent nations, but one Europe

united in a great Federation. It is, however, vain to discount in advance hopes or dreams of which the realisation still lies (as the present writer believes) in an obscure future. The Russian revolution drags slowly on; the German, notwithstanding the votes of Socialist Congresses, shows no sign of action—and even the most hopeful among the ardent revolutionists do not look for the realisation of their propaganda for many years to come; whilst the question I have been discussing cannot wait for years, but presses for instant solution.

I have argued the problem from every side, and I think that I have shown that the English alliance is our best guarantee against war, if a general disarmament, which I should prefer, but to which France possibly might not assent, be impossible. The *entente* with England is not only the best guarantee against war itself, but in case of war it protects us against the worst consequences of a war, and most assures us of the possibility of continuing without a break the economic, political and social evolution of our country. I maintain, moreover, that if England has a strong motive to uphold the *entente cordiale*, France has a still greater. Defeated at sea, temporarily invaded, England might be ruined, but nevertheless she would retain her national existence, and her internal liberty would suffer no restriction. France, on the other hand, bound to Germany, would be ruined by victory as completely as by defeat: her liberty would be swept away, her independence compromised. For England it might possibly be more advantageous to be victorious with Germany than defeated with France as her ally. For France, I believe, in the event of a Continental *entente*, it would be better for her to be defeated by England than to conquer with her allies—so fraught with future dangers would such victory be.

And what of humanity at large? Its interest is that peace should be maintained, that free nations should subsist where social problems can be tested and developed by Germans as well as by others who are fighting against various forms of tyranny. For humanity, then, I hold that, so long as despotic governments last in Europe, the Anglo-French *entente* is the most advantageous condition for its development and progress. Each year, it is absolutely certain, brings nearer the realisation of that fruitful, universal and durable peace. Should, thanks to it, the social enfranchisement of Europe proceed—the evolution on which the twentieth century will without doubt pride itself—it will be recognised how great a part the Anglo-French *entente* played in bringing about this glorious future.

ALFRED NAQUET,
Ancien Sénateur, ancien député.

THE POPE AND FRANCE

I HAVE been asked by the Editor of this Review to give any impressions or information in my power on the present religious crisis in France. A foreigner finds it difficult to form a confident opinion on the details of a question in which local circumstances and local passions play so large a part. Still I cannot but see that the English Press is ignoring facts and considerations which to Catholics, English and French alike, appear all-important in forming an equitable judgment. Again, as a Catholic I have opportunities of hearing the point of view of French Churchmen, which is very imperfectly represented in the English newspapers, and as editor of the venerable *Dublin Review*, which since the days of its foundation by O'Connell and Cardinal Wiseman has endeavoured to keep the English public *au courant* of events of importance in the Catholic world, I have secured the co-operation of colleagues, French and English, whose knowledge of the situation is exceptionally intimate, and on whose absolute candour I can rely. This is a special advantage in a case where each party so often doctors the facts to make them tell in the direction it passionately desires. I was, moreover, in Paris just after the events of the 11th of December, and can speak to the opinions current among those most closely affected by the action of the Holy See. Perhaps these credentials may seem at all events sufficient for the limited observations I shall offer.

I shall attempt, then, to summarise the views of those who have a claim to speak with special knowledge, and to point out that the almost universal opinion of Catholics as to the events now taking place differs materially from that which is generally maintained or assumed in the English press.

The general view current in England is that the Separation Law is directed against the encroachments of clericalism and against a political Catholicism which is a danger to the State. It is, I think, recognised that the law is somewhat hard on the Church. But the trend of opinion is (we are often reminded) with the anti-clericals. The French Church must submit, as our own Established Church has had to submit in England, to have its privileges curtailed, or as the 'Church of Ireland' had to submit to disestablishment.

The attitude of MM. Clemenceau and Briand has (it is pointed out) been in a certain degree conciliatory. M. Briand's measure itself is liberal as contrasted with earlier proposals. They both seemed disposed at the outset to apply it so as to give the Church real freedom in its own sphere of religious influence, and to effect the process of disendowment gradually and not inconsiderately. This attitude and spirit are recognised (it is asserted) by moderate and liberal-minded Catholics who have concurred with the opinion of the episcopate, which is supposed to have decided by a large majority that the *Associations Cultuelles* described in the law might be formed and worked. The large bulk of the clergy also were in favour of forming the Associations. But Rome, caring only for her own power, or wishing to embarrass the Government, or yielding to German *influence, and represented by a Pope and Secretary of State innocent of sound judgment* or diplomatic tact, has overridden the wishes *of the French Catholics. Rome, by forbidding* the formation of the *Associations*, has decreed a state of persecution and spoliation for the hapless clergy of France. As loyal Catholics they have accepted it, but sorely against the grain. The same thing has happened in respect to M. Briand's circular of the 1st of December, regulating public worship in the absence of *Associations Cultuelles*. M. Briand imposed on the priests the mere formality of an annual declaration of public meeting, giving thereby a liberal interpretation to the Act of 1881, which in its more obvious sense required a declaration for each service, as being a separate meeting. Bishops and priests have obeyed the papal directions which forced them to do what they were unwilling to do—to decline making the declaration. Rome has, by her whole policy of *non possumus*, endeavoured to create a fictitious impression of a persecution on the part of a Government, when in reality her own action is responsible for the persecution. The bulk of Church property could have been saved had the *Associations Cultuelles* been formed. It was Rome who refused to form them. The Church services could have gone on legally after the 11th of December, had the declaration required by the law of 1881 been made. Rome refused to allow it, and thus rendered the clergy liable to fine or imprisonment.

The view to which the best information at my disposal points, and which is not, I think, adequately realised in England, maintains almost every fact assumed in the account just given to be either inaccurately stated or wholly false. And I may add that in holding it to be essentially false many Catholics whose views are comparatively conciliatory and progressive are at one with the most *intransigeant*.

M. Paul Sabatier, in his recent book on Disestablishment in France, written for the instruction of English readers, speaks of the enlightened French Catholics of the new school as likely to come 'nearer and nearer to the democracy and the free-thinkers.' The

general impression left on the minds of M. Sabatier's readers is that it is the *intransigeant* Catholics, the political opponents of the Government, who alone decry the Act of 1905 and accuse its framers of hostility to the Church. The present writer may say at once that, when visiting Paris for some days on the 16th of December last, he derived most of his information from M. Thureau-Dangin, the distinguished Academician, one of the twenty-two who joined the late M. Brunetière in petitioning the Pope for measures of conciliation, and the Abbé Ernest Dimnet, whose name is familiar to English Catholics as a representative of the comprehensive theology of the *Revue du Clergé Français*, and whose recent work, *La Pensée Catholique en Angleterre*, has been so fiercely attacked in the *Études Religieuses* by the more Conservative French Jesuits. No Royalist or Intransigeant, not the Comte de Mun or M. Drumont himself, could speak more strongly than did these able writers against the injustice and insolence displayed by successive Governments in the whole course of anti-clerical legislation since 1901. But indeed M. Sabatier largely misconceives the nature of the differences among Catholics both in France and in our own country. He writes with delightful *naïveté* of the 'intellectual and moral differences between the clients of St. Januarius and the Catholics formed in the school of Newman,' apparently not knowing that Cardinal Newman went out of his way in the *Apologia* to avow his belief in the very miracle thus singled out as the symbol of contemptible superstition—the annual liquefaction of that saint's blood in Naples. The religious liberalism of the last century, free thought, the destruction of established religion, these were the great objects of Newman's attack for the first half of his life. His conservative philosophy of religion on Coleridgian lines—parallel on some points to Burke's political philosophy with its defence of prejudice as often the practical safeguard of wisdom—was opposed in its first principles to the whole Jacobin movement, of which French anti-clericalism is the representative. Newman's philosophy was, moreover, largely a defence of what is to M. Sabatier credulity and superstition. M. Sabatier's reference to him is unfortunate and fortunate—unfortunate for his own argument, fortunate as reminding his readers how little familiarity he has with the currents of Catholic thought of which he writes so fluently, and how little he can be trusted as an authority on this subject.

Before setting down in outline the general view of the situation taken, I think, by the bulk of French Catholics, and the differences between the more *intransigeant* and the more conciliatory, I should like to remind those Englishmen whose memory is short, of the complete falsification by the event of the view which our Press took at first of M. Waldeck-Rousseau's legislation for the religious orders in 1901. This was the first stage of the campaign against the Church of France of which we are now witnessing the development. Our

journalists wrote then very much as they write now. Then, as now, they urged that the object of the law was not hostile or persecuting. They pointed to M. Waldeck's assurances that the religious congregations would not be interfered with except so far as was necessary to prevent them from being a political danger. They were to apply for authorisation by law. Such an application was to be in most cases a mere matter of form. Authorisation was to be given except where strong reasons could be shown for withholding it.

When a cry of terror arose from monks and nuns, and community after community left the country, declining to come within the meshes of the law, our Press then, as now, accused them of impracticable fanaticism. Then, as now, the sympathy of Rome with their action was decried as being inspired by political reasons and as savouring of hostility to the Republic. When the orders took refuge in Belgium and England and elsewhere, pleading for the hospitality due to persecuted men and women, our Press retorted that the cry of persecution was a 'pose.' They had in reality exiled themselves rather than submit to a reasonable law, which for most involved a mere formality.

Those who remained in France were applauded as men of common sense and genuine patriotism, who trusted the assurances of the rulers of their country that no harm was meant to them. We know the sequel. Yet let me once more record in outline, for the sake of those who may be ready to forget, the assurances of M. Waldeck as to the scope and intention of the law, and their practical interpretation by his successor.

(1) On the 27th of June, 1901, M. Waldeck declared in the Chamber that the Bill, so far as it was meant to dissolve the orders, was designed only to 'disperse those monks who are plotters against the State and those who interfere in politics.'

(2) To Dominicans, Benedictines, Carthusians, and others it was represented that they had only to go through the formality of applying for authorisation as an act of submission to the State, and they would be left unmolested.

(3) With a view to helping the Government in its peaceful and *paternal work they were asked to give all particulars of their property and their numbers, which it would not be very easy for the Government itself to obtain.*

(4) There were many houses and schools belonging to already authorised congregations, but not themselves *separately* authorised. For them the question arose, Did the existing authorisation of their order cover them? If not, they must decide whether to go or to apply now for authorisation. M. Waldeck, in his paternal kindness, declared such an application to be quite unnecessary. The existing authorisation protected them. "Let them stay." And they stayed.

Nothing is gained by hard words, and it would not be easy to find the appropriate adjectives to qualify the administration which carried

out the law. Eighty-six congregations of men and two hundred and eleven of women said from the first roundly that the Government simply meant their extermination; that to trust its word, its pledges, its sense of honour would be madness. Such language was stigmatised as unpatriotic, unmannerly, bigoted, fanatical. But it represented a conviction too deep to be shaken by the abuse of irresponsible onlookers. The congregations left the country, taking with them as much of their property as they could. The subsequent action of the Government was directed therefore not against the disaffected, not against the opponents of the Government, but against just those orders which had trusted it, which had accepted its assurance that the law was honestly meant for the legalisation of the orders and the expulsion only of such as were 'political' or 'plotters against the State.' M. Waldeck at this juncture retired, leaving the carrying out of his pledges and the execution of his law to his successor M. Combes. M. Combes' method of performing his task was as follows—to take the above four heads in order:

(1) No examination whatever was made as to the charges of political Catholicism or plotting against the State which had been given as the only ground on which expulsion would be resorted to. The charge was not even alleged in detail against any but a handful of Assumptionists, and vaguely, but without an attempt to adduce evidence, against the Jesuits.

(2) The assurance given to Dominicans, Benedictines, Carthusians, and others that, apart from such evidence, they were all to stay, was interpreted as meaning that they were all to be evicted and their whole property confiscated. Five orders only, out of the whole regular clergy of France, were suffered to remain.[1]

(3) The schedules drawn up by the orders as to their numbers and their property, demanded in their own interests, in order that they might have legal standing and protection, were employed as useful documents to ensure not a monk escaping nor a farthing of his money from being saved.

(4) The assurance that new houses of already authorised orders already possessed legal authorisation—an assurance on the strength of which they kept themselves and their property in the country, and in the power of the Government—was interpreted as meaning that they were not authorised after all, and moreover that they should not be authorised now. In June, 1902, 130 schools belonging to them were closed by the Government; in July, 2,500 more were shut up.

To make his work quicker, M. Combes got rid for the occasion of the controlling influence of the Senate. One Chamber alone—so he decreed—should decide the fate of the orders, and a law was

[1] These were the Trappists, the Cistercians, the African Missions, the White Fathers, and the Order of St. John of God.

passed to that effect. The Senate was assigned the five orders which were to be allowed to stay. Twenty-five teaching congregations were refused authorisation *en bloc* at one sitting of the Lower Chamber, twenty-eight at another. The rest followed quickly. M. Combes had practically made one head for the whole monastic organism, and he proceeded to cut it off.

I recall all this not only to remind Englishmen that the view taken at first by our own Press as to the tenour and probable issue of the law was at once similar to their view of the present situation and legislation, and proved to be wholly false, but also because quite inevitably the sequence of events produced the profoundest impression in Rome. And this impression has had, I believe, a large share in determining the present attitude of the Holy See. Englishmen may forget, but in such a matter not Rome, whose interests are so deeply affected. The law of 1901 was the culmination of the attempt persevered in for some twenty years by Leo the Thirteenth and Cardinal Rampolla to 'rally' Catholics to the Republic, and to pursue in its regard a policy of undeviating friendliness—with at no time any substantial response. The *esprit nouveau* of M. Spüller raised hopes for a few months, but nothing came of it; and now at last open persecution and breaches of faith without a parallel in modern times came from the Government of that very country with which Rome had so persistently sought alliance and an *entente cordiale*. It was a most severe lesson, not to be forgotten. Two views had, as we have seen, been taken even among Catholics as to the spirit and intentions of the Government of 1901. One party had taken its assurances to be on the whole reliable, its motives really what they professed to be. The others quickly scented reasons for the suspicion that it had undertaken to carry out the campaign against Christianity which the Radical Socialists and Freemasons had long been urging. This second view was confirmed by fact after fact. The judicial tone of M. Waldeck-Rousseau and his assurances were now seen to have meant only that the first step must be taken securely and without scaring either the orders or the public at large. Else the second could not be achieved. Public opinion must be enlisted on the side of the Government. Political Catholicism, Clerical encroachments—these were foes which might be fought with the world's approval. Therefore they were the only alleged objects of attack. Such an attack was indeed self-defence on the part of the State; and while the world held that it was forging only an effective defensive armoury, it completed undisturbed its equipment and its strategical operations for a war of extermination.

Probably M. Waldeck did not in his heart desire himself to carry the campaign to its next step. But none the less that step was inevitable. The Government was pledged to carry out the anti-Christian policy which was the least impracticable of the proposals

of the importunate extremists who left them no peace until one or other of their demands was satisfied. The real moving power at the back of the law was thus fanatically anti-Christian. It was no case of equitable legislation, firm but not unfriendly, whose motives were political rather than irreligious. It was the beginning of a movement for the extirpation of Christianity, whose stronghold in France was the Catholic Church.

Those who had all along maintained this view naturally enough claimed that the event justified them. And the Holy See considered that they were right. 'Once bitten twice shy,' says the slang proverb. Henceforth to trust assurances, to believe in alleged friendly motives in the further prosecution of the campaign, would be at least rash. The orders which applied for authorisation received with hardly any exceptions simply extinction and complete spoliation. And history was likely to repeat itself. Kindness and conciliation must henceforth be sharply scrutinised. They were likely again to be only the Waldeck-Rousseau stage in the further prosecution of the campaign, to be followed by the Combes stage. The object was to get the Church within the meshes of fresh legislation, which the Ministers who introduced it might interpret in a friendly spirit, and their successors use for purposes of relentless destruction.

The story of the rupture of diplomatic relations with Rome—of which there was no hint during the reign of M. Waldeck-Rousseau—was a complete confirmation of the view that a relentless hostile campaign against the Church was on foot. I happened at the first stage of the dispute to meet a distinguished and experienced foreign diplomat whose sympathy with the Papacy as such was less than nothing. He assured me that the method pursued by the French Ambassador, M. Nisard, in refusing at the outset to specify in writing his cause of complaint against the Vatican, was a flagrant breach of diplomatic etiquette. And the pretext for the final rupture was the performance of a purely spiritual duty on the part of the Holy See. It was simply and solely the summoning to Rome of two Bishops, Monseigneur Geay and Monseigneur Le Nordez, to give an answer to grave charges against them in the performance of their episcopal duties. On the ground that the Organic Articles forbade a bishop to go to Rome without leave from the Government, the rupture was completed. It mattered not that the Organic Articles had never been accepted by Rome, and that such summonses had been constant and had never been objected to. Diplomatic relations were terminated and the Nuncio dismissed.

M. Clemenceau has completed this part of the dispute, displaying manners quite worthy of M. Combes himself, expelling Monsignor Montagnini from the Nunciature without warning, and confiscating the official papers, because the Pope declined to recognise as

a law applying to public worship what a fortnight later all the world agreed did not so apply.

When the Separation Law was first proposed by M. Combes the *Journal des Débats*, which represents moderate Republican opinion in France, described in weighty words the fatal sequence which was likely to be repeated:

> M. Combes speaks (says the writer) of a separation which should leave a certain liberty to religion. . . . At starting we always hear only of gentle and agreeable measures. All is to be kindly, easy, and peaceable. Six months later the whole country is plunged into a religious and social war. The law of associations was to be a liberal measure: it was to take account of distinctions and to admit of being temperately applied; it was to let certain religious associations live quite freely. We know how in the event it has turned out. Will it be otherwise with M. Combes' scheme of separation? The President of the Council enunciates to-day large views, fitted to rally round him all the waverers, and to make sure of the goodwill of Radicals who have become hostile.

And this has been from the beginning the anticipation in Rome as to the course of the measures for the separation of Church and State. Catholics looked forward in dismay, not to a free Church in a free State, which they would gladly accept, but to the new endeavour to cripple its power of free action, which was to be expected, though the first offers were likely enough in part to disguise it. M. Buisson had indeed early in the day let the cat out of the bag and pointed to a separation law as likely to break the strength of the Church by opening the door to schism.

The attitude of Rome may perhaps be paraphrased thus:—

> The Concordat was a bilateral contract. Each party—Church and State—was represented in its formation. Rome accepted in it a very inadequate compensation for the Church property confiscated at the Revolution. In justice, if it is rescinded, the claim to the confiscated property should be revived. But let this pass. We are ready to bow to the inevitable and to submit to disestablishment if the Church is given real autonomy. But it is the merest folly to accept uncritically a measure framed mainly by men who are, we know, aiming at our destruction, and whose apparent concessions are in all probability disguised snares. Let us have a voice in the arrangement. Let us point out what is essential for our liberty, what is tolerable from our point of view and what is not. Why is the French Church to be limited in its power of providing financially for the future? Why is it to have State auditors for its accounts? In Prussia, again, where the State and Church are friendly, the parish priest is *ex officio* the head of an association of worship. Why not in France? How can it be reasonable to ask us to accept a law framed by our enemies? Even if their intentions were fair, they are not familiar with the constitution of the Church. And in point of fact the probabilities of the case point to hostility only disguised so far as is necessary for the sake of appearances. M. Clemenceau has for years bragged of his aggressive Atheism. His ribald jokes about 'Satan, his noble father,' do not give confidence in him as an ecclesiastical legislator. He may have remarkable, even great qualities as a statesman. But on this subject his real aims are not likely to be very different from those of M. Combes. As recently as the 19th of June

M. Clemenceau caused a sensation in the Chamber by a blasphemous speech about Christianity. In August M. Briand, in addressing a congress of teachers at Amiens, remarked, 'Il faut en finir avec l'idée Chrétienne.' Two years ago at Lisieux he boasted in a public speech 'nous avons chassé Dieu et le Christ des écoles, de l'université, des hôpitaux, des prisons; il faut maintenant les chasser du gouvernement.' M. Briand was the original author of a Separation Bill more hostile to the Church than it was thought wise to introduce. He has since then learnt the wisdom of professing moderation; but a man with such avowed desires is hardly one to regulate the administration of religion or to be trusted with the interests of the disestablished Church. If such men are to legislate let us either have a real conference, in which our own representatives can point out what is necessary to us, or let us be prepared to give as wide a berth as may be to their proposals. Their legislation is likely enough to be so framed as to give facilities when the opportune moment comes for further hampering and crippling the Church even where we do not at present detect them.

This appears to be what I may term the initial root-attitude of Rome, with which it has approached the closer consideration of the actual proposals; and it is one in which on the whole the large bulk of French Catholics concur. They thus repudiate, as I have above said, every item in the view current in the English Press. They deny that the Separation Law is directed only against political Catholics, and affirm, on the contrary, that it is directed against the Church, and against Christianity itself in the long run. They deny that Clemenceau and Briand have been actuated by a genuine aim of permanent conciliation. They hold that apparently conciliatory steps are temporary and are due to the fact that such able statesmen see that these will best secure the end to which the new legislation tends. They are, as I have expressed it, the Waldeck-Rousseau stage of the Separation Law and will sooner or later be followed by the Combes stage. The riots over the inventories and the fall of Rouvier were a warning to the responsible ministers not to go too fast. They are wise in their generation and have taken it. Catholics deny again that the Church will be accorded real liberty, and it is with a view to securing real liberty that they would choose rather to sacrifice their property than to give the State power to cripple the Church by schism. It is not true to say that the moderate Catholics trust the Government as being friendly to religion while Rome does not. The difference has been only as to the wisest policy for the moment in dealing with men who are regarded by Catholics almost with unanimity as carrying out the desires of the implacable enemies of the Church and of religion. And this brings me to the situation at the present moment.

First as to the papal *non possumus* in respect of the formation of the *Associations Cultuelles*. It is generally believed, as I have said, that Pius the Tenth had been deeply impressed by the sequence of events above recited in the case of the Associations Law. The treatment accorded to those who had obeyed the Government, and acted on the law and trusted its assurances, impressed on him deeply what

I may call the duty of being suspicious. And the course of events did not allay his suspicions. The Government not only had broken off the time-honoured diplomatic relations with the Holy See, but would not even on this special occasion hold communications with the Head of the Church when they were dissolving the solemn Concordat of France with his predecessor. They did not even notify to him that the Concordat with the Holy See was at an end. With fanatical and pedantic insolence, they declined to allude to the Pope or to the bishops or to the *constitution* of the Church in the text of the law even where it needed elaborate circumlocution to avoid such references. The most that had been gained by the Catholics was Article 4, which stipulated in general terms that each association should be framed in conformity with the *rules* of the special *worship*—a concession in gaining which M. Ribot took, to his honour, a great share. But this apparent concession was practically neutralised by the framing of Article 8, which enacted that the claim of an association to own a particular church should be decided, not by the bishop or by the Pope, but by the Council of State, which may be and is recruited from non-Christian or anti-Christian sources, and whose deliberations are secret and never submitted to the tribunal of public opinion. It was the civil constitution of the clergy over again, and Pius the Tenth could no more accept it than Pius the Sixth. The weakening of the Church by schism had been spoken of by M. Buisson as a wished-for result of the Act, and Article 8 naturally appeared to the Pontiff to be the means whereby it was to be effected. It was in harmony at once with his simple and saintly character and with his sense of the presence of inveterate and unscrupulous enemies, to break away from juristic subtleties and precarious accommodations, and look for the Church's safety to that position of simple autonomy and trustful poverty with which she won her first victories over a persecuting State in the early centuries. Saul's armour was to be set aside, and battle was to be done with a stone and a sling.

Yet among the most weighty—though not, I think, the most numerous—representatives of the Church of France the trial at all events of the law was counselled in preference to sacrificing at once the whole of the property of the French Church. Abbé Gayraud wrote ably on the subject in the *Revue du Clergé Français*. A large proportion of the bishops were in favour of his policy. They rejected indeed the *Associations Cultuelles* with practical unanimity, but the Archbishop of Besançon's proposed *Associations Canoniques*—an adaptation of the law which it was hoped the Government would accept—found favour with very many bishops. It is generally believed that Rome was prepared to assent to this, although the Holy Father's own instinct was from the first the other way, and that the later change in his practical attitude was due not to the initiative of Rome herself but to the strong and urgent representations

on the other side of French Catholics of influence. The effect of these representations was reinforced by the agitation over the inventories. The *Associations Canoniques* had not, it was finally judged in Rome, a sufficient legal security, and though the existing Government might give assurances of their acceptance, experience had shown that such assurances would be wholly valueless so far as their successors were concerned. And so in the end the great sacrifice of from three to four hundred millions of Church property was made.

We come now to the most recent stage of the conflict. If English journalists had taken into account the Holy Father's well-grounded mistrust of a set of men who, whether their attitude is for the moment more or less conciliatory, never forget the ultimate object of 'uncatholicising France,' they would hardly have represented the rejection of the terms held out in M. Briand's circular of the 1st of December as a final demonstration of blind and unyielding arrogance. The political good sense of Englishmen is naturally apt to revolt at the mere notion of sacrificing a substantial advantage to considerations of form; and they have been led to believe that compliance with a trivial, if humiliating, formality is all that was required of French Catholics in order to secure a lasting peace with the enemies of their religion. The case is far different, as a glance at the text of the circular itself is sufficient to show. As to its spirit, the following passage is significant:

> It must not be supposed that because a declaration made in accordance with the Act of 1881 entitles a minister of religion to continue his ministrations in the church where he ministered under the Concordat, the church is therefore to exist for his benefit, and that he shall enjoy similar rights over the building to those which belonged to the suppressed Vestry. The Vestry was invested with the legal possession of the church; the rector or incumbent will henceforth be only an occupier without legal status. He will have no right to perform any act of government (*aucun acte d'administration*); still less will he be competent to perform any act of disposal (*aucun acte de disposition*).

Let it be conceded that the required notification to the authorities of an intention to worship God in the parish churches of France is in itself no hardship; let it be conceded that the assimilation of religious services to company meetings, debates and public festivities (implied by having recourse to the Act of 1881), constitutes only an ideal objection: yet it is plain that the situation of a parish priest under that *régime* as interpreted by M. Briand, would be absolutely intolerable. The provision that the police have the right to be present at any 'meeting' and to disperse it in case of disorder—by whomsoever provoked—means that the right of public worship shall be virtually at the mercy of a municipality. And the initiative and responsibility conferred upon a committee of three, or in default upon the two persons who sign the notification, and of whom one need not even be a resident in the *commune*, would be a continual provocation to unedifying conflicts if not to actual schism. As to the concessions of

which so much has been said—the simplification of certain formalities—they are not even permanent and certain; since a Ministerial circular is not a law, and binds neither the judges, nor the Minister's successor, nor the Minister himself.

But this is not all: M. Briand's circular positively aggravates the injustice of the Separation Act in its dealing with the seminaries. He lays it down that the professors of a seminary form to all intents and purposes a *veiled* association (*dissimulée*); and on this flimsy pretext determines that they are to be for ever deprived of the use of buildings erected at the cost of the faithful, *even by lease from municipalities*. Surely nothing could be plainer than the intention of the Government to strike directly at the very existence of the French priesthood.

Whether his action has been wise or not judged by diplomatic standards, the truth is that the Holy Father has recognised clearly the spirit of relentless aggression which the French Government desired partially to veil, and has acted on that recognition. Far from inventing a state of persecution, he has brought into relief a real state of persecution which its authors wished to disguise. An indignant protest, coupled with a great act of renunciation which must disarm those who would accuse the Church of unworthy motives, has appeared to him at once more effective and more characteristically Christian than any endeavour to negotiate indirectly with inveterate enemies who are likely in the end to outwit him in strategy as they are his superiors in physical force. In one weapon and one only the Church is stronger than the State—in the moral force of principle and a good cause. To denounce the anti-Christian campaign which is designed to destroy her power by inches, to draw up her forces in unity, zeal, and apostolic poverty—this was the best policy just because it was no policy. And it was the most direct and urgent form of appeal to the people of France, and to Catholics throughout the world.

Its actual effect in Paris made a great impression on me during my recent visit. Nothing struck me more than the whole-hearted way in which the action of Rome has been accepted by those who at first had urged a policy of conciliation. 'One may wish the general to adopt one kind of strategy,' said M. Thureau-Dangin to me, 'but if he adopts another, the great thing is to obey orders and show a united front.' The Radical Papers had said with their customary politeness that the grasping ecclesiastics would most certainly do anything to keep their property. On this account the refusal to form the Associations was not feared. The action of the Church has thus wholly disconcerted them. In the event, whatever may be said from the standpoint of human policy, the action of the French Church stands out as a very remarkable moral protest and a display both of the apostolic spirit and of absolute discipline at a moment when especially union is strength.

I spent some time on the morning of Monday the 17th with Monseigneur Amette, the coadjutor to the venerable Cardinal Archbishop. He told me that on Saturday the 15th a police commissioner had called and said that the Archbishop must leave his palace that day. Two days of grace were, however, in the end accorded; and now in a few hours the old man of eighty-eight was to leave the house which the Archbishops had lived in since 1831—the house of Monseigneur de Quélen, of Monseigneur Affre, who was shot on the barricades in 1848, of Monseigneur Darboy, who was killed by the Commune in 1871. St. Sulpice was to be also closed in two days, and all its sacred memories, beginning with the days of M. Olier, violated. The formation of *Associations Cultuelles* would not have averted this destruction of historic landmarks and traditions. It would only have postponed it for two years. The coadjutor Archbishop described the clergy as resigned and absolutely united. He looked forward to a great renewal of life and influence for the French Church to be won by the sacrifice of her worldly property, and the zeal which comes of persecution. On the absolute unity displayed—so great a power in time of war—he was very emphatic. That unity has indeed deeply impressed outsiders to the Church, as may be seen in words lately published in an English journal which has stood almost alone in extending to French Catholics that sympathy in their persecution which was so general among Englishmen when similar treatment was accorded to them in 1793. The *Saturday Review* of the 15th of December thus refers to the united stand which French Catholics have made:

Their attitude is historically remarkable, for never before in the struggle between the State and the Vatican in France has French Catholicism so unanimously ranged itself on the side of the Papacy. When Louis the Fourteenth raised the standard of Gallicanism against Innocent the Eleventh he could count on the aid of Bossuet and the flower of the French episcopate. Even Pius the Sixth's condemnation of the civil constitution did not prevent four bishops and a large section of the French clergy from giving their adhesion to the religious establishment inaugurated by the National Assembly. In the stern contest between Pius the Seventh and Napoleon, a large section of the French clergy were Imperialists. Why, if there is a grain of truth in the allegations of the English supporters of the *régime* of persecution, is no such aid forthcoming to M. Clemenceau and his merry men to-day? True, the French Church may be more papal in sentiment to-day than it was of yore; but certain recent controversies—for instance, those on Anglican orders and Biblical criticism—have revealed the important fact that a considerable section of the French priesthood is not in sympathy with extreme Ultramontanism. Such facts render the solid unity in the Catholic Church of France, and the united resolution of its members to suffer undeserved loss and shameful persecution, the more impressive. Only an issue of the first moment could have united so great a body, hampered as it is by Erastian traditions, in so magnificent a protest. For the time the clouds are black, and there seems little hope of a popular reaction against Jacobinism in the land of St. Louis. From the greater part of Christendom, to its shame be it said, there comes but scant sympathy with the

persecuted Church. History, happily, may be trusted to set the matter right, and to do a generous if tardy justice to the brave men who are fighting the battle of religious liberty before the world, and are preserving for France the faith of Christ.

It used to be the fashion in England to treat as the fanaticism of credulous Catholics the attribution of the campaign against the French Church to the influence of the Freemasons. The revelation of the masonic delations in the Army in 1904, which led to the resignation of General André and the fall of M. Combes, gave a shock to this view, and ought to have killed it once for all. Englishmen learnt with astonishment of a system of *espionnage* whereby Catholic officers were denied promotion because they were reported to the Lodges as being the husbands of devout wives, or themselves churchgoers, or as having sent their children to Catholic schools. For a time the reality of masonic persecution was realised among us. But old prejudices are hard to kill. The incident has been forgotten, and, though maintained with less confidence, some of the old scepticism on the subject has returned. On the reality of masonic influence in the present war on the Church, no one with whom I talked in Paris was more emphatic than M. Dimnet, whose worst enemies could not accuse him of undue credulity. Dr. William Barry, in the *National Review* of July 1905, placed the matter beyond doubt for those who really desire to know the facts.

The anti-Catholic fanaticism of French and Italian Freemasons is, indeed, no secret, although Englishmen are slow to believe in a temper which is so uncongenial to them that they are unable adequately to realise it in imagination. The *Revue Maçonnique*, in December 1902, published a frank avowal on the subject. 'Freemasonry,' it says, 'is not understood everywhere in the same fashion. The Anglo-Saxons have made of it a brotherhood which is at once aristocratic and conservative in politics and religion. . . . As for Latin freemasonry, it owes its distinctive peculiarities to the battle it is waging against Catholicism.' The sayings of MM. Clemenceau and Briand, quoted above, show at least that if from motives of policy they judge it well to help on the campaign in question, there is nothing in it repugnant to their own sentiments. M. Camille Pelletan, Clemenceau's old friend and colleague, naïvely avowed a few days ago that Pius the Tenth seemed to be the providential instrument of their designs. At a time when they desired to confiscate the Church's property, but could not venture to do it at once, the Pope solved the difficulty by giving it up rather than accept the new law. M. Viviani, the new Minister of Labour, addressed the Chamber last November in a speech which had the true masonic ring in it. He treated disestablishment as the seal set to the extinction of the light of religion in the land, and the exposure of its falsehoods. 'We have extinguished in heaven lights which will not be rekindled,' he said; 'we have taught the toiler and the destitute that heaven contained

only phantoms.' The speech was vehemently applauded and publicly posted in the streets. These speeches have been reported in the English Press. I refer to them here only as illustrations of the fact of which French Catholics are as a body convinced, that what is going on is not legislation with the view to the ultimate liberty of the Church, designed to purge Catholicism of political elements, but is on the contrary, in the minds of its chief promoters, part of a campaign directed through the Church against Christianity. To exhibit this view as the true key to understanding the present attitude of the Vatican, and its unanimous and, for the most part, enthusiastic acceptance by the French Church, has been the main object of this article.

WILFRID WARD.

AFGHANISTAN AND ITS RULER

THE coming visit to India of Ameer Habeeb-ullah again brings into prominence the relations of the Indian Government with the ruler of the Afghan State, and suggests the question whether the time has not arrived for a revision of the existing engagements in order to place those relations on the solid basis of mutual trust. For, however much we may regret the fact, it cannot be denied that our policy towards Afghanistan has not been so definite or so clear as to leave no room for doubt or misapprehension on the part of the Ameer.

No one underrates the value of firmness in international politics, especially with regard to a State over which we exercise a controlling influence, but minatory language without any real necessity, mistrust when sound policy required confidence, a constant suspicion that Afghanistan may prove a frail reed to rely on—do not seem to anybody watching the course of events from an independent standpoint, as the proper method of dealing with a sensitive nation.

I do not hold a brief for the Ameer; my object is to present the other side of the question in what I conceive to be the true interests of the British Empire, in the hope that the point of view of an independent observer may have its use in looking at the general question.

The present ruler of Afghanistan is still under forty. Without his father's severity, he combines much strength of character with a benevolent and kindly disposition, which has been construed by some of his critics into weakness. He is conversant with several languages, including English, all of which he speaks with fluency. He is well-read in the history, literature, and traditions of Islam, and is thus able to hold his own against any of the *mullahs* or priests of his country. From all accounts he is neither an obscurantist nor a bigot, although like Western sovereigns he has to keep in check any personal latitudinarianism out of deference to the prejudices of his people. He has a fair knowledge of contemporary history, and is said to have watched with peculiar interest the struggle between Japan and Russia.

In 1884, I met, during a visit to Karachi, a notable figure in Afghan history—Sirdar Shere Ali Khan, ex-Wâli of Candahar, who only a short time before had been expelled from his principality by the Ameer Abdur Rahman. Afghanistan was still in a chaotic condition; the tribal organisation was still unbroken, and many of the chiefs

who had been driven out of the kingdom still entertained hopes of re-entering the country. The prospect of Abdur Rahman ever seating himself firmly on the throne so as to pass it quietly to his successor was uncertain. In a long and interesting conversation on Central Asian politics, the expelled Wâli, who bore no love to Abdur Rahman or his sons, ventured on a prophecy which subsequent events have largely verified. Habeeb-ullah was then a mere lad, but the Wâli observed if the young man lived and succeeded his father he would be the means of making the rulership permanent in his family, 'by removing the evil effects of his father's reign, as he was a youth endowed with discretion and a merciful nature.'

An interesting work [1] published a short time ago in India by a Mussulman scholar in close touch with Afghan notables and conversant with Afghan politics, gives a good account of Ameer Habeeb-ullah's early education and general bringing up. Specially trained by Abdur Rahman in the work of administration, he served an efficient novitiate before he was entrusted with the Regency during the late Ameer's absence from Kabul. For eight or nine years he was practically associated with his father in the task of government. He thus brought to the throne an experience rarely vouchsafed to Oriental sovereigns. The goodwill and confidence of a ruler of this stamp, apart from every other consideration, must be of value to us in our dealings with a State within our exclusive sphere of influence. But when we look at the authority he wields over his own people, the necessity of cordial relations becomes doubly apparent.

On his deathbed Abdur Rahman had nominated Habeeb-ullah Khan as his successor, and this nomination was accepted by all the members of the family, the nobles, the functionaries, and the *mullahs* present. On the day following his death, the ceremony of *baiat* was performed and the oath of allegiance was formally taken by the people. To understand the significance of this ceremony and the sacramental character of the oath taken on the occasion, it is necessary to bear in mind that generally speaking the right to the throne in Mahommedan countries is based partly on succession, partly on nomination, and partly on the oath of allegiance—which is a survival of the old republican idea of election. The sovereign must belong to the ruling family; in Turkey he must be a descendant of Osman; in Persia, of Agha Mohammed Khan Kâjâr; in Afghanistan, of Dost Mahommed Khan Barakzye. Ordinarily the eldest surviving male member of the royal house is entitled to succeed—a custom borrowed from the practice of the Arabian tribes in pre-Islamite times. But the rule has no sanction in the laws of Islam. The reigning sovereign has thus the power to set aside a senior member of the family who happens to be incompetent or physically or mentally unfit, in favour of a junior.

[1] *Nairang-i-Afghan* (Afghan History), by Syed Mohammed Hossain Aghlab 1904).

It is apparently on this principle that Sultan Abdul Hamid proposes to pass over his cousin Reshad Effendi, who is said to be suffering from a serious malady, and nominate his own son, a young man of considerable energy of character, for the succession to the Sultanate.

In theory, family descent and nomination are not sufficient to absolutely legitimatise the title until the oath of allegiance has been taken. The *baiat* is a sacramental function; and in former days was an act of great solemnity. At the seat of government the oath was taken 'on the hand of the sovereign'; in other places, the chief functionary acted as his proxy. 'And anyone who forswore his oath and rose in revolt placed himself beyond the pale of the law.

Nowadays in Turkey and Persia the performance of the *baiat* has become a formal ceremony; and, generally speaking, only the chief functionaries, the great nobles, and the *Ulemas* take the oath on their own behalf and that of the people.

So long as the Caliphate of Bagdad was in existence, the great potentates of Asia and Egypt scarcely ever resorted to popular *baiat* for the legitimation of their title. The investiture they received from the Caliph affirmed their right to the allegiance of their subjects. When the Ottoman sovereigns took over the Caliphate they claimed the same powers and privileges as the Caliphs of Bagdad and the titular pontiffs of Cairo, and their claims were mostly admitted by the Sunni princes of Central Asia.

Nothing proves the genius of Ameer Abdur Rahman so much as his appreciation of the altered circumstances of the Mahommedan world. No such sanctity as attached to the Sufi monarchs of Persia or to the children of Osman belonged to his line; they had not even the pretensions of the Kjârs; the Barakzyes were only as any other among the many tribes of Afghanistan. There was no central authority, as in the days of the Abbassides, to legitimatise in the eyes of his people his sovereign rights by formal investiture. And even if recognition by the Ottoman Caliph would have been helpful to him in validating his title in the Sunni world, it would certainly have given offence to a powerful and suspicious neighbour, who would have perceived in his act the bogey which is, at this moment, frightening the nations of Western Europe. He saw that the stability of his family and the safety of his kingdom rested on the whole-hearted acceptance of him by the nation as their chosen sovereign. Whether the Agreement which the chiefs, nobles, *mullahs*, and people of Afghanistan presented to him was their spontaneous act or whether some impetus was not given to it from above, it marks a turning-point in the history of that country. That compact between people and sovereign and the subsequent conferment on him by the Afghan nation, without, so far as one knows, one single dissident voice, of the title of *Zia-ul-Millat w'ad-Din*[2] absolutely legitimated his rulership. In political history

[2] 'The Light of the People and Religion.'

these two events point to the emergence of Afghanistan from an inorganic into an organic state.

The compact consists of five clauses. The first clause describes the beneficent character of his rule, the benefits he had conferred on his subjects, the order and safety that prevailed in the kingdom, and then goes on to say

> We, your faithful subjects, have unanimously thought fit that the title of the 'Ameer of the Moslems, the Light of the People and Religion,' should be added to your other titles, and with this prayer we bring to your Majesty the insignia which we have prepared for your gracious acceptance.

The second refers to the demarcation of the boundaries of Afghanistan under Abdur Rahman's rule which removed all causes of dispute with other States, and

> which are like the four walls of our house for the safeguarding of our independence, religion, honour, and safety. . . . For this, we, your faithful subjects, are everlastingly grateful; and we regard our land as sacred and bind ourselves to defend every inch with our lives.

The third refers to his administrative arrangements, to his patronage of qualified and worthy people, the suppression of disorders, the expulsion of evil-doers, and goes on to say

> We consider these arrangements are conducive to our good, and we accept them with all our hearts, and we shall always be ready to sacrifice our lives for our king, and shall never refuse him our loyal obedience.

The fourth, after referring to the justice, peace, and order he had introduced into the country, proceeds thus :—

> We, the people of Afghanistan, enter hereby into this solemn pledge that we look upon you as our rightful sovereign and regard ourselves as your faithful and loyal and devoted subjects, and we bind ourselves that among your noble descendants whomsoever you should select to succeed to the throne we shall obey him with loyalty, faithfully and devotedly, and should anyone from among the tribes of Afghanistan or elsewhere think of rebelling against his authority, we shall consider his punishment as a religious duty, and for the true fulfilment of our pledges we offer the guarantee of the Almighty and His Prophet.

In the fifth they bind themselves to provide one man out of every eight able-bodied males for military service.[3]

The importance of this document is not confined to Afghanistan; it has a significance for India also. It shows that henceforth the Indian Government in its dealings with the Afghan ruler is not concerned with the head of a particular clan or tribe who enjoys for the time being the support of other tribal chieftains, but with a national sovereign with the people at his back. The innate patriotism of the Afghan, instead of being desultory and dispersed, now centres in the throne of a prince accepted of the nation. It is a matter for regret that,

[3] The *Nairang*, p. 182.

instead of welcoming the consummation as a source of strength to the British Government, some of us should view it with suspicion. To politicians and publicists of this frame of mind, a disintegrated, disorderly Afghanistan offered better chance to England to maintain her supremacy. This somewhat sinister idea is expressed in the most recent work published in England on Afghanistan.[4] Whilst recognising the great change that has taken place within the last quarter of a century 'in the controlling forces' in Afghanistan,' the author observes with some *naïveté*

> It is to us not a matter of gratification altogether, for it merely shows that the tribal leaders of noble families have lost their influence, that they can no more sway factions or parties in the population, and that power in Afghanistan is being gradually centralised around the Ameer in a circle of officials which is controlled by the Mullahs.

With reference to this it must be observed that wherever religion forms a part of national life, the priestly class must exercise a great influence; even in Western countries where religion is kept more or less in the background, the clergy occupy a commanding position in society and politics. In Afghanistan, with all their narrow learning and limited horizon, they form the best educated section of the population, and are naturally regarded with respect amounting in places to veneration. And Habeeb-ullah Khan, who is more of a scholar than his father, pays them a certain deference. But he has made no endeavour to withdraw the curb the late Ameer had placed on their pretensions; and their political influence is no greater than in the preceding reign.

How Abdur Rahman reconciled the assumption of the title of 'The Light of the People and Religion' which the nation had bestowed on him with his spiritual allegiance to the Ottoman Caliph, it is difficult to say. But the fact shows that even in Afghanistan the people and their leaders are prepared for political development. The place which the late Ameer had won in the hearts of his subjects by his devotion to their interests is now held by his son, who has received from them the title of *Sirâj-ul-Millat w'ad-Din*.[5] Such is the ruler whose visit to India is looked forward to with interest and curiosity by all who consider the predominance of England in middle Asia vital to the British Empire; they feel that we cannot afford to do without his confidence in the disinterestedness of our policy, or let him imagine that we do not trust him. He has been called foolish, bigoted, contumacious and what not. If the facts are carefully examined, it would be found that like his father he has behaved, in circumstances of great difficulty, with singular circumspection, and maintained unswerving fidelity towards the Indian Government.[6]

[4] 'Afghanistan,' by Hamilton Angus.

[5] 'The Lamp of the People and Religion.'

[6] The *Nairang* deals very fully with this subject.

How deeply Abdur Rahman felt the suspicion of the Indian Foreign Office is clear from his own writings. In a letter[7] to a friend in England, written in 1894, he speaks with much bitterness of the attempts that were being made by interested parties to sow the seeds of quarrel between India and Afghanistan, and repudiates vehemently any thought of a breach of faith on his part.

Another cause of constant irritation to Abdur Rahman, as the author of the *Nairang* observes, was the somewhat unsubstantial character of the guarantee by the Indian Government in case of an unwarranted attack on Afghanistan. There were two treaties with him; both contained an engagement to that effect on the part of England. On three occasions the worth of the assurance was tested; on three occasions Afghan territory was invaded and Afghan troops massacred. In no instance did England, the custodian of the foreign relations of Afghanistan, obtain any redress for the wanton aggression. Are the Afghans unjustified in thinking that the so-called guarantee is deliberately vague to suit English policy? The Afghans are no fools; they probably see as far as most people, and naturally think that if their existence as a nation has an eventual value it should be guaranteed without reservation. That was the animating purpose of Abdur Rahman's whole reign; and that seems to be the object of Habeeb-ullah Khan's policy. Twice the late Ameer visited India at the special invitation of the Indian Government; and on both occasions he appears to have carried away the impression that he was a mere pawn in a selfish game. It is to be hoped that this will not be the impression which will be created in the mind of his son.

In the treatment of the Afghan problem two conceptions seem to play an important part. One is the idea that as the Afghan State is a creation of the British Government any deviation from the course chalked out for its rulers by Anglo-Indian officials is tantamount to ingratitude and treachery. The other is that the Afghan character is innately treacherous and that, therefore, no trust can be reposed on Afghan promises. These two ideas frequently find expression in language little calculated to win the goodwill of a high-spirited people. The late Ameer was fully cognisant of these influencing factors, and there can be little doubt that his successor is aware of them. Apart from the impolicy of the accusations, a word may be said regarding the accuracy of the facts on which they are based. Long before Abdur Rahman had been invited to Kabul by the British Government, he had indisputably acquired a strong footing in Northern Afghanistan, and been accepted as their ruler by a large body of the people. When the British addressed themselves to him he was the only possible man to take charge of the derelict kingdom of Kabul. The acceptance by Abdur Rahman of the British invitation furnished to the Indian

[7] A facsimile of this letter was printed in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October 1894.

Government an escape from a peculiarly difficult situation. It is doubtful if any question of gratitude arises under these circumstances. It was a matter of mutual interest, and Abdur Rahman recognised that his lay in absolute fidelity to his pledges to the Indian Government.

The other idea, that the Afghans are innately treacherous sprang from the fate of the British Envoy in the first Afghan war. If the history of Indo-Afghan relations since Elphinstone's mission were written without bias we should probably find that the Afghan nation has been greatly misjudged; that the rising which engulfed the British troops was due to popular fury at the desecration of their hearths and homes and not to fanaticism as is commonly supposed. To the British Envoy, who disregarded all warnings of the coming storm, history has been most lenient. Whilst negotiating with the Afghan chiefs for a safe convoy to India, he offered a reward for the head of their principal leader—a direct incentive to assassination. He fell into the trap he had himself devised; and paid with his life for his misguided diplomacy. So far as treachery is concerned, there is little to choose on either side.[a]

The time has arrived, I submit, for discarding these ideas which have done so much harm in the past. Lord Minto is fortunate in the opportunity afforded to him of winning the confidence of the Ameer by personal converse; of pointing out to him the way by which he can further develop the resources of his kingdom and make it march on the lines of modern progress. The extensive tour arranged for him, the preparations made to impress him with the power and greatness of the British Empire, indicate that the Indian Government does not under-estimate the importance of Habeeb-ullah Khan's visit. But no amount of spectacular display will attain the object principally in view unless measures are taken to place Indo-Afghan relations on a clearly defined basis in which mutual trust should form the dominating element.

A strong Afghan kingdom united by intimate ties with British India is of the utmost importance to the permanent security of England's Asiatic Empire. The idea that the Anglo-Japanese alliance renders it unnecessary for India to take measures for her safety, or that Russia's internal pre-occupations remove all danger, I consider fantastic—as fantastic in fact as the dream of a real, working Anglo-Russian *entente* applicable to the near or middle East. The lessons of history teach us that like causes almost invariably lead to like results; that two nations whose interests do not always run on the same lines, whose political and moral ideals are dissimilar, must at some time or other, in spite of a superficial identity of religion or civilisation, come into conflict. Ameer Abdur Rahman, who was better acquainted

[a] The curious reader will find an interesting article on the diplomacy of the time in the *Calcutta Review* for 1850, vol. xiv. p. 296.

than most men with Central Asian politics, firmly believed in a collision, soon or late, between England and Russia. Such also was the conviction of Sirdar Shere Ali of Candahar, and such is the apprehension of most Indians whose minds are not warped by theories and who remember the hand Russia had in working up the Mutiny.

Whether the conflict will take place over Persia or Afghanistan is a matter of small concern. What fate has in store for the former country it is difficult to tell. After centuries of stupor she is awakening into life. Her new 'Parliament' has been ridiculed; her efforts to breathe under healthier conditions are viewed with indifference. The Persian National Council does not even receive the credit so lavishly bestowed on the suppressed *Duma*. It has proved its patriotism and a knowledge of the trend of events by refusing so far to sanction the joint loan proffered by England and Russia. And now it is proving its political insight by discharging the arrears of pay to the troops by a national subscription. Russia, with General Ignatieff as her instrument, helped in suppressing the Turkish Parliament. Whether the Persian Parliament will be allowed to exist when there is a question of loan involved remains to be seen. Afghanistan has so far avoided the entanglements of 'loans.' Her foreign relations are in the charge of a great Power, which avoids complications. Even the unwillingness of the ruler to open the country to railway enterprise or to grant concessions to outsiders for purposes of exploitation is not without a certain advantage. It prevents all the trouble which besets most other Oriental countries overrun by foreigners.

Our first effort, then, should be to win the entire confidence of our visitor, and to disabuse him of the idea of any *arrière-pens'e* on our part. No Afghan is free from that idea: mistrust on one side breeds suspicion on the other. As we do not fully trust them, they imagine that the Indian Government has some design which is kept in the background, and the frequent talk about spheres of influence in Persia and the joint offer of the loan add to their mistrust. Again, the fact that in spite of the 'Dane' Treaty we do not accord to the Ameer the coveted kingly title is regarded as a proof of insincerity.

The position of Habeeb-ullah Khan, as already pointed out, is very different from that of the Ameers who preceded Abdur Rahman. Though his kingdom is smaller and he has an engagement with England which controls his relations with other foreign States, his hold and his influence over his people are greater than even that of Ahmed Shah Durrani. The kingdom is better organised, the tribal chiefs in better order than even under that monarch. Dost Mohammed Khan had modestly declined the designation of Shah offered to him after the battle of Candahar when he overthrew Shah Shuja and his British auxiliaries. Abdur Rahman and Habeeb-ullah have both been acclaimed by the people as their legitimate rulers. It would be a graceful concession to the sentiments of the Afghan nation if we willingly regularised his

status by according to him the kingly title. It would probably pave the way for a friendly discussion of other and more important subjects. But the two questions which will, in all probability, occupy the serious attention of the Viceroy and the Ameer are those relating to the import of arms by the Afghan Government through British territories, and the guarantee to Afghanistan against outside attack. The one hinges on the other. The Afghan ruler wants an absolute guarantee, an assurance of help, in case of an unprovoked attack, not hedged round by qualifications or reservations. Is there any reason for not revising the old engagements so as to make the guarantee more effective in Afghan eyes? Again, would it not strengthen our own position in Afghanistan?

The Ameer must be perfectly aware of the fact that his country cannot safely do without the support and protection of England. In these circumstances it cannot be difficult for statesmen to devise an arrangement that would satisfy both parties.

If a well-ordered and well-organised Afghanistan is necessary to India, the import of arms by the Afghan Government to keep its troops in a proper state of efficiency seems equally necessary. Either that country must be sufficiently strong to serve the purpose towards which our policy is directed, or it must not. The latter view, though intelligible, may be regarded as beyond the range of practical politics. Inadequate preparation on her part to meet the danger we apprehend is almost worse than none—for it gives rise to a false sense of security. So long as Afghanistan is faithful to her pledges, the solution of the question ought to offer no difficulty. In all probability, when the Ameer is convinced of the straightforwardness and disinterested character of our policy, he might be inclined to withdraw his father's restriction on the use by his subjects of the Chaman Railway.

But it seems more than doubtful whether, under present conditions, he would entertain the project of organising his military resources with the help of British agency. The introduction into the country of British officers on any but an inconsiderable scale will be viewed by the people as part of a sinister design on their independence and will be resented accordingly.

The late Ameer did not favour the idea of sending young Afghans to Europe for education; he considered, not without reason, that, left to themselves, they imbibed with much that was wholesome a good deal that was not salutary to their moral development. Habeeb-ullah Khan does not, if report speaks correctly, share his father's extreme views; and, although anxious to promote education among his subjects by the establishment of polytechnics and schools, he is not indisposed, it is said, to encourage their proceeding to foreign countries in quest of knowledge. As a possible solution, then, to the difficulty of training the Afghan forces by outside help, I venture to suggest that the Ameer should be invited to send a selected number

of promising young men to receive a thorough military education in England and British India. And the invitation need not be confined to the military line; youths might be sent also for scientific and technical education. Afghanistan would thus in time come to possess her own engineers and craftsmen, her own scientific experts capable of developing her economic resources. Considering that these young men would naturally become the pioneers of modern progress in their country, British India might well undertake a part of the expense of their education. And if they are well treated and kept under proper supervision there is no reason why they should come under any unhealthy or demoralising influences in the West.

These remarks are offered by way of a plea for better defined and more cordial relations with a State whose safety is so closely allied to that of India.

AMEER ALI.

THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN PRINCES

THE education and training of young Indian princes and their near relatives are among the many problems of the present day; the matter is of sufficient importance to call for the serious attention of those concerned. There seems to be much difference of opinion as to the best manner in which young Indians, of the ruling class, should be educated so as to render them fitted to fill the future position they will eventually hold with credit to themselves and advantage to their people.

The different ways of educating these boys are:

At home, under private tutors; at Chiefs' Colleges, established in different parts of India; or, lastly, by sending them to Europe.

The question that remains undecided is, Which of these three methods of education will be most effectual?

The real advantages and objects of education are to thoroughly train the mind, mould the character, and make the boys in every respect broad and open minded; in short, to make them true and thorough gentlemen, so as to enable them to hold their own in any position in life which circumstances may oblige them to face.

Can this result be obtained in India? I decidedly think not, and this I will endeavour to demonstrate below.

The chief drawbacks of the first system of education are, to my mind, the impossibility of keeping the boys free from the evil influences of their surroundings in their homes, and these cannot, in any circumstances, be avoided. A few may have the natural strength of character to resist undesirable influences and remain unaffected; but a large number succumb, and deplorable results ensue, as is commonly known. Such misfortunes are constantly occurring, and the reason is not far to seek. In cases of boys being left minors, an English tutor, or guardian, is appointed, who usually remains in contact with his pupils during the period of their lessons and games only. During his absence the boys are forced into the company of interested persons whose sole object seems to be to poison the minds of the innocent children against their relatives and the officials in their respective States, and whose self-interest predominates over all other considerations. What is still more reprehensible is that these so-called

courtiers find means to utterly ruin the children by teaching them to indulge in habits or practices of a most undesirable kind. Even the British Government, which frequently becomes guardian during minorities, or the boys' fathers cannot possibly do anything to counteract the effect of such vitiated surroundings and the influence of persons who are always on the alert to seize the first available opportunity of furthering their own ends. In such company there is every temptation for the boys to follow the evil example of such people, as well as of some of their immediate relatives, and the practices in which the latter indulge; they naturally and unconsciously fall into their habits, and in a very short time become useless nonentities with absolutely no ambition or object in their monotonous lives. In my opinion it is most unfair to deliberately place helpless children amid such unhealthy surroundings and unscrupulous intriguers, and the society of such persons is the surest way of completely wrecking the boys' career.

The second system, and the one mostly resorted to in these days, is that of sending the young princes to Chiefs' Colleges.

I have visited more than one of these institutions and, theoretically, they are to be recommended, as, so far as I could judge, they are more or less based on the same system as English public schools; most decidedly these colleges will help, to a certain extent, to keep the *morale* of the boys untarnished. It is, however, impossible to expect that a child's mind can remain innocent and unblemished for long, as during the vacations the boys must return to their homes, where they fall afresh victims to the same demoralising influences which they were subjected to before they went to college.

What little good the boys derived during their term at school is undone during the frequent periods spent at home; and this procedure continues until the Government of India presumes that the education has been accomplished, when they must return to their homes to rule. In the case of younger brothers and relatives, more often than otherwise, they return with no definite object in their lives and no work to occupy their time. Thus their scholastic career ends, and they are sent adrift to look after themselves with only a mere veneer of education, and hence become examples of that hybrid type of humanity so emphatically condemned by those in the highest authority in India.

To my mind the great drawbacks to these institutions are the unsurmountable difficulties due to rampant caste prejudices which prevent the boys of different castes from messing together; no *camaraderie* or true brotherly feeling can possibly exist if such obstacles are permitted to stand in the way of free intercourse; I am grieved to say that institutions which uphold and are the true champions of these prejudices do not fulfil my ideal of places of learning. Owing to the principle of non-interference in religious matters, the

British Government does not feel itself justified in trying to bring about the non-observance of social barriers; and the greatest misfortune is the actual insistence on the strict compliance with nonsensical caste rules. I neither advocate the abolition of the Chiefs' Colleges, nor do I consider that they will never be successful; but I do hold that, as at present constituted, and from the kind of training given, much benefit cannot be expected.

Taking all these considerations into view the only possible solution, in my opinion, is to send the princes to Europe as early as possible before the age of puberty; if sent later they might run the risk of acquiring all the vices of the West together with those learned at home, without in the least reaping the solid advantages of a Western education and training. In every system of education there are advantages and drawbacks. In educating princes in Europe, therefore, there is much to be hoped for and something to be feared. But if education, as I have pointed out, is commenced at an early age and conducted under proper supervision, the results, I am convinced, will be on the whole a success, and it will be found that the advantages will more than counterbalance the defects.

The chief objections which are continually put forward against a European education are that it is apt to make a boy too Europeanised, to cause him to lose touch with his people, to render him discontented with his surroundings, and to be unhappy unless and until he finds himself in the midst of European life and society, where his earlier days have been spent. These are possible drawbacks, though I believe that in the majority of cases they need not be apprehended. The principal benefits to be derived from the surrounding conditions of life in European schools will form the pupils' minds and characters, thus creating honourable and upright men able to hold their own and to fight their battles against all adversities and difficulties of life.

Trained and cultivated under such auspices there is every chance that a man could fulfil any position in life creditably and successfully. The growing generation of these youths should be sent not only to England, but to other European countries and America, so as to enable them to acquire the best knowledge that Western art and science can teach them. They should begin by receiving the foundation of a good general education, and, as they grow older, they should be given the fullest scope for studying any special branch of science or art, and be allowed to follow any profession for which they may show a particular aptitude. I am afraid it is perhaps premature to hope that my views and suggestions will appeal to many of my brother princes and chiefs at this peculiarly transitory period of India's history. But it is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when most of them will come to realise the actual sterling benefits to be derived from such a measure, and will send

their sons and young relatives *en masse* for training and education Westward. This general exodus of our youth to Europe will convince them that if suitable education is to be given to their offspring, in their own country, appropriate institutions must be founded, organised, and managed on similar lines to those of the West and free from caste prejudices and restrictions, the most serious barriers to the true progress and advancement of the princes and people of India.

JAGATJIT SINGH.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE INCOME-TAX

THE Report of the Select Committee on Income-tax, not altogether logical in its conclusions, the result of discordant views held by leading members of the Committee, is nevertheless a document of far-reaching importance.

It will afford the Chancellor of the Exchequer one of those rare opportunities which occur now and then in our financial history—the opportunity for an epoch-making Budget. The stars in their courses are with the Chancellor of the Exchequer to light him on his way. A keen desire for economy in public expenditure, combined with a strong demand for a more equitable distribution of the burden of taxation, place within his reach the magic power of consenting circumstance.

The Income-tax now plays such a large part in our financial system that it must of necessity take a foremost place in any re-adjustment of national revenue. This colossal engine of finance, as Mr. Gladstone once called it, is now going to be overhauled, brought up to date, and adapted to the new conditions of modern times.

No statesman would now indulge Mr. Gladstone's expectation that it might be dispensed with altogether. His view as to the permanency of the tax coloured his ideas as to the machinery needful for its operation, suggesting limitations which the nature of the case did not necessarily involve.

No doubt the Income-tax was originally imposed as a war tax by Pitt in 1798 in a speech described by Mallet Du Pan 'as not a speech, but a complete course of public economy, a work, and one of the finest works upon practical and theoretical finance that ever distinguished the pen of a philosopher and statesman.' The tax was abolished in 1816 on the termination of the war. We now, however, look upon the Income-tax as a peace tax. It was so intended by Sir Robert Peel when he reimposed it in 1842, for the purpose of reforming our fiscal system by reducing the tariff on no fewer than 750 articles of commerce. It is not without significance that it is anticipated in well-informed quarters, if President Roosevelt succeeds in persuading Congress to pass his scheme for an Income-tax, the proceeds will be devoted to a similar object.

Although now made applicable to meet the ordinary expenditure of the State, the Income-tax possesses the latent and valuable power of ready increase and expansion in time of war.

A rude shock was given to the theory that the Income-tax was the nation's war chest when taxation was imposed to meet the balance of South African War expenditure not provided for by borrowing.

Almost as large a requisition was then made on indirect taxation as on Income-tax. This also must be kept in view in any readjustment of the tax.

Two complaints have long been urged against Income-tax on the point of equity. First that a uniform rate presses unfairly on industrial and professional incomes. And secondly that the present system presses too hardly on the lower incomes immediately above the present limit of abatement.

Those who shelter themselves behind Mr. Gladstone in their opposition to any differentiation in the rate of tax will have difficulty in maintaining at this time of day his view that the Income-tax 'is not well adapted for a permanent portion of your ordinary financial system.' Those stout opponents of differentiation forget that Mr. Gladstone conceded the principle as just and fair. What could be more emphatic than the following quotation from the great Budget speech of 1853 ?

> What we understand to be the sentiment of the country, and what we ourselves as a matter of feeling are disposed to defer to, and to share in, is that under our present financial arrangements the Income-tax bears, on the whole, too hard upon intelligence and skill, and not hard enough upon property as compared with intelligence and skill.

Mr. Gladstone went on to say that the main question was one between land and trade, and proceeded to show that for the year 1853 the Income-tax derived from lands and houses under Schedule A amounted to 2,400,000*l.*, out of a total tax of 5,600,000*l.* On the other hand the produce from Schedule D, trades and professions, amounted to only 1,200,000*l.*

The relative positions are now more than reversed. In 1905 the produce from Schedule A had increased to 7,884,804*l.* as compared with 2,400,000*l.* in 1853, showing a threefold increase.

But the produce from Schedule D had in 1905 increased to 18,261,716*l.* as compared with 1,200,000*l.* in 1853—a fifteen-fold increase.

We have omitted certain adjustments which might be made with the other schedules which would have the effect of still further increasing the disparity.

The total net produce of the Income-tax for 1905 was 30,966,404*l.*, each penny of Income-tax bringing in to the Exchequer over two and one half millions sterling.

In 1853 lands and houses paid twelve twenty-eighths, and trades

and professions six twenty-eighths of the whole tax. In 1905 lands and houses paid seven twenty-eighths and trades and professions sixteen twenty-eighths, or more than half of the whole tax and more than double that paid by lands and houses under Schedule A.

These figures, while they are a striking testimony to the development of our commerce, constitute from Mr. Gladstone's standpoint an imperative demand for the reconstruction of the Income-tax.

Even under the conditions existing in 1853, notwithstanding his individual opinion, Mr. Gladstone was forced to admit, 'It is on all hands agreed that the Income-tax is not adapted for a permanent portion of your fiscal system unless you can by reconstruction remove what are called its inequalities.'

We have dealt at some length with Mr. Gladstone's views, not only on account of their importance coming from such high authority, but because Mr. Gladstone has been quoted, by many who had failed to grasp his real attitude on the question, in support of fiscal theories which he would have been quick to repudiate.

It is worth noting that Mr. Disraeli, with that intuition with which he was so richly endowed, proposed in the ill-starred December Budget of 1852 an Income-tax of 7*d.* per £ on realised incomes and 5½*d.* per £ on precarious incomes.

On this same Budget the Derby Administration was defeated; even a differentiated Income-tax could not save the political situation.

In 1861 an attempt was again made by Mr. Hubbard's Committee to deal with differentiation, but no practical conclusion was reached, although various plans were suggested for consideration.

These facts clearly show that even on this branch of the subject the Select Committee which has just concluded its labours had no light task to discharge.

Nor is the fact disputed that the present high rate of tax presses very heavily and unfairly on the lower incomes which lie above the abatement line.

It is self-evident that a shilling Income-tax presses much more severely on the man with an income of say 800*l.* a year than on his neighbour who enjoys an income of 8,000*l.* a year.

Graduation

The real remedy for both grievances is a reconstruction of the Income-tax on modern lines. Democratic in our ideas, conservative in practice, graduation has been held to be unworkable in this country in consequence of the large amount of Income-tax which is collected at the source, amounting roughly to three-quarters of the whole tax.

Nothing is to be gained by minimising or ignoring difficulties in the way of reform. It is, however, astonishing to find when we look back over the last half-century how many reforms, economic and political, declared to be impracticable in their application and

impossible of attainment, have by a process of natural evolution quietly taken their place in our system of government.

And so it will be with regard to the graduation of the Income-tax.

The evidence of the official witnesses, including Sir Henry Primrose, the chief of the Inland Revenue Department, will be of great service in the solution of the problem with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to deal.

It was frankly admitted by them that income taxed at the source could be graduated up to incomes of 1,000*l.* a year, even under the incubus of our present cumbrous system of abatements.

More significant still was the evidence which conceded that earned incomes directly assessed could without difficulty up to 2,000*l.* a year enjoy a differentiation by a lower rate of tax.

It is not too much to say that there was not an Income-tax reformer in the Committee, or out of it, who could have foreseen or dared to prognosticate so frank an assurance of practicability from Somerset House.

The Income-tax is at present graduated by abatement up to incomes of 700*l.* a year.

The abatements given with the Income-tax at 1*s.* are equivalent to a direct tax of

1⅓*d.*	per £ on	incomes of	180*l.* a year
2½*d.*	,,	,,	200*l.* ,,
4*d.*	,,	,,	240*l.* ,,
6*d.*	,,	,,	320*l.* ,,
8½*d.*	,,	,,	500*l.* ,,
11*d.*	,,	,,	700*l.* ,,

It is open to question whether one-tenth of the taxpayers who claim abatement realise the small rate of Income-tax they at present pay.

Tell any one with an income of 500*l.* a year that he pays an Income-tax of only 8½*d.* per £ and he will very likely contradict you, if he does not laugh at the suggestion.

How much better would it be if each taxpayer had the means of knowing exactly the rate of Income-tax he had to pay.

Foreign countries and our own Colonies have demonstrated the practicability of graduation.

The adoption of a direct graduated tax does not necessarily involve the abandonment of taxation at the source.

Investments under Schedule C and dividends under Schedule D might continue to be taxed at the source and shown as deducted in the direct individual assessment returns.

Under Schedule A if the owner were taxed directly instead of through his tenant, who now pays his landlord's tax and deducts it

from his next payment of rent, the change would not in any way jeopardise the efficient produce of the tax.

It is well, therefore, to bear in mind that a graduated Income-tax may be combined with the retention of partial collection at the source.

A graduated Income-tax progressively increasing with the amount of income would ensure the recognition of two canons of taxation commended by political economists—namely, that a tax should be levied according to ability to pay; and that the taxpayer ought to know exactly how much he has to pay.

Let us now consider how incomes are distributed, and whether that distribution supports the case for graduation.

The Income-tax payers number 1,100,000, according to the latest estimate; of these 800,000 are below the abatement limit.

The gross amount of income brought under the review of the Inland Revenue Department for 1905 was 912,129,680*l.* In his evidence before the Select Committee, Sir Henry Primrose stated the aggregate income on which, after deductions, tax was payable at 728,000,000*l.* He estimated the income enjoyed by individuals to be 678,000,000*l.*

This gigantic total may be divided into three parts:

	£
Incomes of 700*l.* a year and under . .	250,000,000
Incomes between 700*l.* a year and 5,000*l.* a year	307,000,000
Incomes of 5,000*l.* a year and over . .	121,000,000
	£678,000,000

If we divide this income into two parts corresponding to the division made by the abatement limit, we find that 800,000 persons enjoy an income of 250,000,000*l.* under the abatement line of 700*l.* a year, and that 300,000 persons enjoy an income of 428,000,000*l.* above the abatement line.

These figures are very conservative and were largely exceeded in the evidence given before the Select Committee by well-known statisticians. Moderate as they are admitted to be, they prove how large an amount of the national income is enjoyed by a comparatively small number of persons.

They do more. They point the way by which, without penalising anybody, a more equitable adjustment of taxation might be made.

Differentiation

Some authorities are of opinion that if a graduated scale of Income-tax were adopted, there would be no need for differentiation. That is not so. The income depending on the exertion of the individual is more precarious than the income from land and houses.

The scheme laid before the Select Committee of 1861 by Mr. Hubbard proposed to tax industrial incomes at two-thirds of the income, and that proportion has generally been considered a fair one, whatever form the relief may take.

The question of classification is one not without difficulty. The Select Committee of 1906 was asked to say whether a distinction could be made between the two classes of income usually designated 'permanent' and 'precarious.' That classification was discarded in favour of 'earned' and 'unearned' income, a distinction which gets rid of many technical objections and has the further advantage that the present classification of the Income-tax Schedules readily lends itself to this division. It is, after all, a rough and ready method, not by any means scientifically accurate, but one which does substantial justice to the different classes, as a glance at the schedules will show.

		Unearned	Earned
Schedule A.	Ownership of lands and houses	A	...
Schedule B.	Farmers' profits	...	B
Schedule C.	Profits from British, Colonial, and Foreign securities	C	...
Schedule D.	Trades and professions	D	D
Schedule E.	Salaries, government and public company officials	...	E

The case of the limited company under Schedule D created some difference of opinion. The view ultimately accepted, essentially a just one, even in the case of a private limited company, was that where the aid of the State was invoked to limit a trader's liability and to convert his interest in the business into the form of an investment, it ought to be taxed as such. It is estimated that earned incomes under Schedule D amount to 208,661,000*l.*, and the unearned incomes to 295,907,000*l.*, or a total of 504,568,000*l.*

For the year 1905 the estimated produce under Schedule D from private trades and professions amounted to 7,560,350*l.* The produce under the same schedule derived from public companies, &c., would therefore amount to 10,701,366*l.*

If the total produce of the Income-tax is roughly divided into earned and unearned income according to the existing schedules the result would be as follows:

	Earned Income £	Unearned Income £
Schedule A	...	7,884,804
Schedule B	210,256	...
Schedule C	...	2,067,852
Schedule D	7,560,350	10,701,366
Schedule E	2,541,776	...
	10,312,382	20,654,022
Total		£30,966,404

It would thus appear that two-thirds of the total tax would be

charged on unearned income partly derived from property, and to a greater extent derived from trade and investments.

Graduation by Super-tax

It has long been the dream of the Socialist to be able to get at the incomes of the very rich for the purpose of imposing heavy taxation.

Mr. Snowden, M.P., advocated an Income-tax of 1*s.* per £ with a super-tax of 6*s.* in the £ on very large incomes. Mr. Keir Hardie was more modest, with a tax of 1*s.* 6*d.* on incomes derived from property and investments, a tax of 1*s.* with abatements on incomes from personal exertions, and an additional tax of 1*s.* 6*d.* per £ on the highest incomes.

None of these proposals found acceptance with the Select Committee, but they decided that the imposition of a super-tax was practicable. Given a personal declaration of income, the imposition of a super-tax on large incomes presents no practical difficulty.

It has been suggested that the levying of such a tax would meet the demand for reform. That is a very superficial view. The taxation of incomes of 5,000*l.* a year and upwards, even at a very high rate, leaving the inequalities and hardships unredressed in the lower incomes, does not appeal to the financial reformer as a possible solution. The Select Committee, while deciding that a super-tax was practicable, give no sign of enthusiasm in its favour.

In time of war such a possible method of taxation would be of the utmost value. From this point of view the advocates of personal declaration of income have much to say in favour of their view.

Personal Declaration of Income

The great struggle for mastery between the progressive economists on the Select Committee and their more conservative coadjutors was waged over the question of a personal declaration of income.

Personal declaration of income is the foundation of any equitable system of Income-tax. If ability to pay is the test, then only will we possess the material to enable us to make a just apportionment. Mr. Bernard Mallet, of the Board of Inland Revenue, showed in evidence that 'the great majority of foreign continental taxes belong to the class in which disclosure of the taxpayer's total income is required.' These countries include Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, and Denmark.

It is the same in the case of the Income-taxes of British Colonies, with the exception of Tasmania. He also stated that in Saxony 'the system of compulsory individual declarations under heavy penalties for misstatements is stated to have been productive of excellent results from a revenue point of view.'

It is not generally known—indeed, it was denied not long ago by a Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons—that by

far the larger number of Income-tax payers in this country under our present system do make such a declaration. Sir Henry Primrose gave evidence to prove that 65 per cent. of the Income-tax payers make a personal declaration of their whole income before getting the advantage of the abatements to which they are by law entitled.

It is therefore not by any means a revolutionary proposal; nor does there appear to be any valid objection against the principle at present in operation being further extended. There is nothing unreasonable in proposing that the remaining 35 per cent. should be brought into line with the majority.

The objection frequently urged, that a personal declaration is in its nature inquisitorial, applies much more forcibly to the 65 per cent. who at present declare. The struggling tradesman or professional man is more sensitive on this point. It is more important to him that the amount of his income should be safeguarded with due secrecy by the Inland Revenue Department than it is to the class who are at present exempt from declaration.

But, indeed, the declaration if honestly made need not lead to any inquisitorial investigation. The present system is carried on with great discretion. The absolute secrecy which obtains in this great department is a tribute alike to the probity of our officials and to the high tone of our national character.

Unfortunately it is too obvious to those who have studied the question that the present system of taxation, largely at the source, without personal declaration, affords scope for much evasion and avoidance of the tax. Sir Felix Schuster's statement that the belief 'that the revenue gets the tax wherever it can, and that there is no more duty imposed on people to make a correct return,' leads undoubtedly to a lax conception of what is required.

Many a man thinks it fair game to dodge the State with regard to certain parts of his income who would yet shrink from making a false declaration of his total income. The morality which can make this very fine distinction is certainly not of a high order, but it is not rare.

Once give the Inland Revenue Department the power to demand a personal declaration of income from each individual and you supply the means of increasing the productive power of the Income-tax, apart from any change in its incidence or amount.

Place this potent instrument in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and you give him the means of absolute freedom of action. Graduation, differentiation, super-tax, each and all are not only practicable, but made easy of accomplishment by personal declaration.

Personal declaration of income has another side, of great importance to the nation, apart altogether from revenue considerations. For statistical purposes the returns of income would be exceedingly valuable. We ought to remove the invidious distinction which we

have attained in comparison with other countries and even with our own Colonies. We must relieve ourselves of the taunts to which we are exposed, of indifference to a branch of national science which we, of all peoples of the world, would profit by, and ought without difficulty to be able to supply:—a statistical department. Its supreme importance, in the interests of our vast commerce and wide Empire, cannot be overrated.

The Select Committee's Recommendations

The plan foreshadowed in the conclusions of the Select Committee is far-reaching, yet withal moderate. It demands no drastic change in our system of collection.

It safeguards collection at the source. It differentiates between earned and unearned incomes. It recommends a further graduation of unearned incomes from the present limit of 700*l.* a year up to incomes of 1,000*l.* a year, or more.

It opens the way to a large measure of relief for earned incomes up to 3,000*l.* a year, and recommends that this should be given effect to by a lower rate of tax, as compared with unearned incomes. The value and importance of this recommendation may be best appreciated when we consider that the Select Committee was composed of members of Parliament, holding diverse views on the science of government, its powers and limitations. Approaching the consideration of economic questions from such different standpoints, they were nevertheless unanimously of opinion that differentiation of earned incomes at a lower rate of tax was practical.

This is indeed a notable triumph for financial reform and common sense. It was not, of course, the business of the Select Committee either to suggest or prepare any cut-and-dried scheme; that rests with the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

If a differentiation is made in favour of earned incomes up to, say, 2,000*l.* a year—there does not appear to be any reason why, on grounds of equity, it need be carried further—then some such scale as the following would give a reasonable differentiation in favour of skill and industry.

New Differentiated Tax on Earned Incomes.		Equivalent of Abatements given on Unearned Incomes. New Scale.	
On Incomes of	Per £.	On Incomes of	Per £.
£160 to 200	2*d.*	£160 to 200	3*d.*
200 „ 300	3*d.*	200 „ 300	4*d.*
300 „ 500	4*d.*	300 „ 500	6*d.*
500 „ 700	5*d.*	500 „ 700	8*d.*
700 „ 1,000	6*d.*	700 „ 1,000	10*d.*
1,000 „ 1,250	8*d.*	1,000 and above,	1*s.*
1,250 „ 2,000	10*d.*		
2,000 and above,	1*s.*		

This allocation is suggested on the basis of a maximum tax of 1*s.* per £. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer desires to maintain the

Income-tax at that rate on the higher incomes, the above plan would permit of relief being given to the smaller incomes without any great sacrifice of revenue. As already indicated, a super-tax is considered practicable.

The recommendation as to personal declaration we give in the words of the Report:

'A compulsory declaration from each individual of total net income in respect of which tax is payable is expedient, and would do much to prevent the evasion and avoidance of Income-tax which at present prevail.'

A wise and definite conclusion which ought to be given effect to with promptitude and discretion.

In one respect it is to be hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer will not follow the lead of the Select Committee. It is a mere matter of machinery, but is of considerable importance. The Committee indicate that the relief given to the earned incomes should be arrived at by a process of double deductions. First by an abatement on the amount of income, followed by the imposition of a lower rate of tax. This double process is quite unnecessary on incomes which are directly assessed. The better and more simple plan would certainly be to levy the tax direct at a lower rate on the real amount of income.

The abatement system thus works out: Instead of levying a tax of 6*d.* per £ on an income of 320*l.*, which is the real rate actually paid at present on that amount of income, a deduction of 160*l.* is made from that income, and the tax charged at 1*s.* per £ on the remaining 160*l.* The above is the simplest example that can be given, as the rate works out at exactly one-half of the nominal rate. As, however, the amount of abatement given varies according to the amount of income up to the abatement limit the actual rate charged graduates up to 11*d.* per £ on incomes of 700*l.* a year. Now it is proposed on the top of all this to make a further deduction by assessing earned incomes at a lower rate of tax.

An income of 320*l.*, which at present pays the equivalent of a six-penny tax, if an earned income, would be subject to a further deduction of, say, 2*d.* per £. But taking the above example the four-penny rate, as it then would be, if charged on the 160*l.* would be equivalent to an Income-tax, not of 4*d.*, but of 2*d.* per £ on the whole income. It would, therefore, be necessary to levy a tax of 8*d.* per £ on the 160*l.*, which is equivalent to a 4*d.* tax on the total amount of income. All this circumlocution can be got rid of by levying on earned incomes, assessed as they will be direct, the real rate of tax with which they are to be charged. It is open to question whether this opportunity ought not to be taken to sweep away the system of abatements altogether.

Relief could be given to the smaller unearned incomes, taxed at the source, by a deduction in the rate of tax on their whole income.

The amount of abatement, including exemption, claimed on income taxed at the source and subsequently returned, by the Inland Revenue, is of comparatively small amount.

What is really required is not further complication, but a simplification of our whole system of collection. The machinery of collection works unequally. What may be called the farming-out system, largely operative in England, is vicious in principle and disastrous in its results. In Scotland under the same Income-tax laws the collection is much more speedy, because it is carried out by the officials of the department.

The Income-tax is due on the 1st of January in each year. By the end of that month, including Inhabited House Duty, 65 per cent. of the total amount charged is collected in Scotland, as against 35 per cent. in England. At the end of February in each year 96 per cent. is recovered in Scotland as against only 62 per cent. for England. On the 1st of March, 1906, there was outstanding in England Income-tax amounting to over eleven and a half millions sterling. The loss of interest on such a large sum is considerable, and an unnecessary burden on the State.

We look forward with expectation to the next Budget. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has before him the opportunity of rising above mere departmental difficulties and of framing a scheme with a due regard to equity and impartial justice to the various interests affected.

Foreign nations have grappled with the problem which we have hitherto regarded as insoluble. Our own Colonies have given us a lead. The two great nations, France and Russia, who are at present exempt from an Income-tax, as we understand it, are also coming into line.

Sir Charles Dilke, the Chairman of the Select Committee, in the able draft Report, which although not accepted by the Committee will ever remain a valuable contribution to the elucidation of the subject, shows that M. Poincaré, the Minister of Finance, proposes 'to replace the existing direct taxes of France by a tax stated to be in the nature of the Income-tax of the United Kingdom, but with differentiation in every portion of the scale.' We have already stated that President Roosevelt is proposing an Income-tax for the United States of America, and a Bill has just been introduced in Congress which provides for a graduated tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer need not lack either inspiration or information.

The Report of the Select Committee is a mine worthy of careful exploration. It is also a testimony to the high rectitude of our Civil Departments, who, not keen for change, eventually admit the obvious and concede the incontestable.

The inquiry is also valuable as showing how even our wisest statesmen cannot safely dogmatise on fiscal and economic conditions which

may be only temporary in their operation. Mr. Gladstone's contention that the Income-tax was unsuited to our financial system, and incapable of carrying a scheme of differentiation, is not now applicable. The evolution of the Income-tax has been a process of slow development. It is only now nearing the attainment of its full power as a 'colossal engine of finance.'

GEORGE MCCRAE.

THE CURSE OF MACHINERY

I SUPPOSE that we may take it for granted that the ordinary non-thinking individual, if the matter were laid before him for judgment, would set down the advent of the motor-car as one of the latest steps in the march of progress. But there are still in being those who cannot look upon the mere annihilation of space as a matter of very great interest or importance; and who, if it were brought about to the detriment of aims of a higher order, could not do other than look upon it as no matter upon which to congratulate themselves.

I do not know what one could take as a good definition of a machine, but however that may be, the thing that any ordinary mortal would call a machine, and not a mere tool, has been among us as a factor largely bearing upon human affairs for something less than a century.

Man seems to have been given the power to expand his taste for experimental research to an almost infinite degree in any direction. Towards whatever point he turns his attention an endless vista of discovery opens out to him, but he seems to have been left no guidance, other than that of the accomplished thing, as to whether his discoveries along any one path are for the moral well-being of the race or not.

Looking backwards upon what one knows of the last hundred years, one cannot but be struck with the possibility that the application of man's genius to the invention of machinery has been fraught with loss rather than gain to the true moral and intellectual progress of the race.

It will not, I hope, take up too much space and time to hold in brief review a few of the various departments of human life into which machinery has brought great changes, and to try to form a hasty opinion as to whether those changes have been really beneficial.

Whether the Englishman of the past has had an inherent love for beautiful forms, or whether the materials for building that have come to hand have, by a divine foresight, of themselves been conducive to beauty in the buildings of which they were the component parts, it would be hard to decide. Probably the truth lies in both hypotheses, but certain it is that almost any English farmhouse,

hamlet, or village that has not been altered by the influence of machinery—either directly or indirectly—has been just the last touch that an artistic eye would feel to be needful to make the prospect complete. The local materials used have been in harmony with their surroundings. The rough-hewn timbers of the roof have in them the curves that the hand of nature moulded in the tree. The vegetable thatch, the wall of local stone, clay, or mud have all been in the same key to which the surrounding country was attuned. The buildings have been sprinkled along the watercourses, in the bottoms where their more formal outlines have not broken in upon the contours of the hills.

It would be hard to believe that lives spent in surroundings and amid prospects harmonious with nature can have received from them no moral influence for good, or that it is not well for the life of man to be at least as attuned to beauty as that of the rest of creation.

Now as to the prospect where the hand of machinery has been at work.

See this fair timbered valley, or would-be fair, rather—for what is it that spoils the whole and sets our artistic teeth on edge? If we would make a picture of it, what is it that we must leave out, or betake ourselves to some other scene? It is the roof of that great barn that offends. Look at the uncompromising rectangles thereof, its uniform grey metallic glitter! Can any man with a soul overlook a cluster of roofs of corrugated iron, set in a fair prospect, without a shudder? Albeit the vaunted machinery of the Black Country foundries produced it, the railway made its use here possible.

I do not know that we need comment more on it. It can tell its own glaring story very well, and unfortunately the softening hand of time will have very little influence upon it.

The art of the thatcher and the thatcher himself too have been banished to make way for the artisan of the Black Country. This is one of machinery's victories. It is only one culled at large from many of a kind.

We most of us have known some little fishing port before and after the railway 'opened it up.'

It used to straggle up the little stream, and each house was placed, not selfishly where it would get the most view for itself, but where it would help the prospect most.

I do not mean to pretend that this was intentional, but where man is more or less primitive—*i.e.* natural—his works seem to be more in harmony with nature by a kind of natural instinct.

Then came the railway with the tripper and the jerry builder in its train, and now the gaudy terraces flaunt their angular straightnesses fresh from the saw mill—not up the valley, but row after row along

the cliffs themselves, as ugly a collection of unpleasing straight lines as ever could be designed to spoil the infinite curves of the shore.

They have indeed gotten their 'view' of the sea—but look at the expense: a prospect spoiled by this marspot for just as many miles as it can be seen.

This is no hyperbole. 'Tis not a wickedness perpetrated in one or two places, but all along the coast. It is the offspring of the machine that runs along the railway.

With whatever of my various diatribes against, or accusations of, machinery, the reader may or may not find himself in agreement, of the lamentable results of its interference with agriculture I believe there will be no two opinions.

It would be no fiction of the pen to say that the stalwart lines of men who, say thirty years ago, used to swing the scythe to the music of the falling ears were the backbone of the country. The wages of the rural labourer were small indeed, pitifully and possibly needlessly so, but, judging by the few remaining specimens of the breed who have survived to the present time, they were a race to whom for kindly geniality and intelligent reasonableness none of us are fit to hold a candle. I can recall the faces of many of these lean old toil-worn labourers, faces that looked as if they were the index of all the sturdy virtues that have been characteristic of the English race.

On every farm of any size throughout the land there were several of them employed, and to the blessings that honest arduous toil brought to them and their posterity was added the joy of work in company.

The ruthless hand of the machine gradually thinned their numbers; they were not wanted, and now the cry of the farmer is that he cannot get the few men that he does want.

Apart from the attraction of the towns there is another cause for this that has been considerably overlooked. Very few men are company enough for themselves, and they dislike monotonous toil in the fields alone. The zest of a man's vying with his fellows for the best work done is gone; and the few men who still have the chance to lend an extra hand at harvest time complain that the 'self-binder' and other ingenious labour-saving appliances of that ilk have taken from the harvest field all its poetry—all its fun, they call it, but, 'tis no matter. The scythe and drashel were instruments fitted indeed to mould the muscle and stiffen the bone of the rank and file of a nation; and if that were a matter of importance—which it certainly is not—it has turned out, I believe, as a matter of fact, that the self-binder and the thrashing machine do not do it any cheaper.

A race of giants banished for gain, and yet no one a farthing the better! (To the other counts against thee, O Machinery! we have to set thee down a fool.)

Within the last few years every town that has been swelled by the tide of immigration, and even some of those that have had the good luck to keep within a working companionable size, have started a system of electric trams. The motive for so doing is obscure, but probably the powers that be have considered that in this undertaking they have been moving with the times, a consolation that no one can deny them.

Now the consequences of our becoming a nation of town-dwellers have been deplored on all sides.

All the thinkers of the age agree that it is, or at any rate will be, a cause of degradation in the national physique. Yet what must we think of the intelligence of a town that provides a cheap and easy mode of abolishing the powers of walking among its citizens? Time was, when the business man and the clerk did at least put their muscles into use by walking to their places of business, likewise the women-folk to their shopping; but now to many of these good people the idea of getting to any place by walking never seems to occur, and the tram service is looked upon as a great improvement. Improvement of what?

Will folk never learn that hardness is the only schoolmistress that can teach, and that all the mechanical aids to luxury are bad through and through and beyond a certain point absolutely devitalising?

Again, machinery in the shape of the railway engine, by forming a cheap and easy means of transit from the country, and in the shape of the manufactories (which, by the bye, is just what they are not) by necessitating the making of things in large centres instead of by local craftsmen, has been without doubt one of the, if not the most, important causes of the rural exodus and the fungus-like phenomenal growth of the towns.

Time was, and not so very long ago either, when the towns were pleasant enough places for a man to live in, and for the love of which it was even worth while his fighting, if need was.

The churches and public buildings were the visible signs of the rise and fall of a nation's art, and the private dwellings, humble it is true, but each bearing the individuality of, and being a witness to, the architectural taste of the individual who built it, as diversified as nature, and yet each town homogeneous and with a character of its own, given it by the local materials the builder was perforce driven to use. I have been in old towns in which one could if so disposed seat oneself down in any part thereof and find the materials for a pleasing sketch.

But what of the houses in the towns to the growth of which machinery has given rise, what are they like? If machinery had been merely the first cause of their being, it would be hard to say how much they might have differed from their predecessors; but as it

is, unfortunately, machinery has had a finger in the pie of their actual building. The railway has brought the cheap and nasty deal from abroad, the sawmill has shaped it into beams, joists, and planks, as shapely as the parallelograms of Euclid.

The railway has brought too the cast-iron railings to which the factories of the North have given birth—a most uninteresting prodigy. Whatsoever of ornament there is in use about the houses has not been the work of the craftsman, and as such a stimulant to his art, but has been almost invariably moulded in some distant factory.

We could write on this subject *ad nauseam*, but to what purpose? Enough of anything nasty, at any rate, is as good as a feast. There they stand, these houses, rows of them, miles of them, unpleasing, horrible. Nothing there is about them for the wholesome pride of the dwellers therein. 'Tis true they serve for a covering from the winds of heaven, and to a certain extent they are sanitary—as witness the very evident cast-iron drainpipes and ventilating shafts.

But are these the only qualities fitting to adorn the dwellings of the highest of creation? Is man to be put to shame by the art of such a humble builder as, say, the chaffinch in the beauty of his dwelling?

Sir Walter Besant in one of his novels has remarked that the most noticeable difference between the times of a hundred years ago and our own is that in the old days everything in the house was made by someone that one knew. The fender on my great-grandfather's hearth was made for his grandfather by Tom Smith at the end of the village. He hammered it out by the sweat of his brow. My grandfather perchance stood by and saw it in the making. A hundred years and more it stood a monument to Tom Smith's muscles and his mastery of his trade.

It may be that the fender upon which you are resting your feet at this minute, and whose composition, as a thing of no interest, you have not before noticed to be of cast iron and brass, came from Birmingham. On the other hand, perhaps it didn't. It may very well be, for all I know, that they make these things in Germany. At any rate wheresoever was the mould in whose womb machinery conceived it, along with some hundreds of its fellows all as alike, and much more so, than a lot of peas, it serves the purpose for which fenders were originally intended as well as the old hand-made article. It does so, but—and to my mind there is no end to this but—we have lost our old friend Tom Smith, and the cogwheels and gangs of machine-tenders possibly now on strike in Birmingham—or Germany, was it?—are in his stead. If you like the change there is nothing more to be said, but how should you like to be one of these same machine-tenders?

In the making of most of our household goods machinery has

done away with the craftsman. True it is that some master-mind plans the design in the first pattern that becomes the father of thousands, but if these things had been made by human hands we should have had not one, but a thousand masters of their trade, instead of one artist only and an army of workmen doing some monotonous routine job for their daily bread. The whole system is a premium on dullness and mediocrity. It may be argued that this machinery more or less makes for cheapness, and on that account a man can become possessed of more goods than he would have had without it; but a man's life hardly consists in the abundance of things that he hath, and it is also quite on the cards that a few good possessions are worth a whole host of bad.

When we come to think that in the making of almost everything we wear, almost everything in the house upon which we step, sit, or lie, machinery has had a hand to the ousting of some craftsman, the enormity of our wickedness becomes clear.

Until quite lately those who had not bowed the knee to Baal were wont to congratulate themselves on one priceless unsullied possession. Our harmonious rural landscapes had become discordant, desecrated were the beauteous villages of our coasts, joy and poetry had fled the harvest field, the manhood of our towns was in a fair way to become a minus quantity altogether, our great towns had become like nothing that ever was in heaven or earth, handicraft had given place to machines and unskilled labour, the picturesqueness of our shipping was dying out, beauty in fact seemed to be veiling her face everywhere, but—we still had our roads.

The wheelwright's art, the horse-breeder's powers of selection, and the daring of the colt-breaker furnished us with means of transit not unattuned to Nature, through whose alleys we made our way. Upon the roads, from one cause or another, strangely enough the blight of machinery had not fallen.

If some denizen of some far off planet were to alight upon this England of ours it could not but strike him that the sole end and object of our lives was to get about as quickly as we could. Whereat he would no doubt admire greatly, seeing that it was a fair land and for real enjoyment's sake one to be passed through slowly. He would no doubt think us to be a race of fools, and I wish I could make all men think so too. It would be at any rate a step in the right direction, if only an initial one.

Let us make believe for a minute. It is a spring morning. The air resounds with the love songs of the birds. The young buds by reason of the genial warmth of the sun are bursting into leaf. The springs, swollen with the winter's rains, gush forth in gladness. All nature is awaking and joyous with life and spirits. Perchance our horse beneath us is if anything a thought too much in keeping with the

rest of nature for a nervous rider. But there! he is but young, it's only play. But stay! it isn't though. Did you hear that raucous 'toot-toot?' 'Now then, steady old boy, it's all right, face it like a horse.'

A cloud of dust, a vision of goggles, the roar and whirl of machinery, a stink of petrol, and the motor has passed us. Twenty, thirty miles an hour was it, and past a young horse? Are manners too being made by machinery?

He has gone, but the morning doesn't seem the same. There is a bad taste left in the mouth. What good purpose is served by this scurry along the leafy roads?

Bias of course will bring a man into strange thoughts, but trying to view it calmly, does any man of anything like decent feeling and education fail to feel the jar and incongruity of it? Can any man of refinement look upon this laying open of the roads to the rush of machinery as really an example of progress in any direction worth having?

I have in the above passages dotted down a few of the most striking instances of the results that have been brought about by machinery as they occurred to me, and probably if we were to follow up the subject in other directions we should come across pretty well as direful consequences.

Even as far as we have gone it does not make a pretty list, which, with the possibility of repeating myself—maybe more than once—I here set down:

Desecration of natural beauty, buildings for the description of which no respectable words can be found, joy and mirth gone from Arcadia, our houses filled with a host of utensils with no hall-mark of the artist on them, the decay of handicraft and the craftsman, labour-saving appliances for the ease, comfort, and consequent destruction of the body, and lastly, the abnegation of all good taste by allowing the rush and scurry of the towns along the country roads.

It might be interesting, if the patience of the reader would bear with it, to go into the reasons why, in the opinion of some of us, the inventive genius of mankind should in these latter days have turned out to be a curse rather than a blessing. It seems to me that a plausible solution of the mystery lies in this—and I do not mean merely to juggle with plausible words—that man is an animal, very largely at any rate, and he cannot suffer himself to wander very far from nature with impunity.

If in the art of architecture, for example, he goes straight to nature for his designs, his art is more or less alive in direct ratio to his faithfulness to her. Let his work, as it always does at a later stage, become stereotyped and it is acknowledged by critics to have lost its life and to be dead.

Is it not possible, though, without stretching the analogy too

far, that man, in setting to work forces extracted from nature, so to speak, as opposed to strictly natural forces—using the forces of steam, electricity, and abandoning the direct force of nature, the winds, the streams, his own muscles, and those of the beasts of burden—may not too be on the road that leads to moral and intellectual death?

In all human things there is a rise and fall. All blessings pushed beyond a certain limit become a curse. Systems and nations decay, and perhaps this may be one of nature's means for hastening the downfall of an effete civilisation.

The seeking after machinery as a saving of labour is nothing more than a phase of the universal love of ease and luxury. In the struggle for ease and wealth, it appears from what the statisticians tell us that we are giving up the begetting of children. The nation that cannot see the writing on the wall—and what nation ever did?—rushes on till its madness ends in suicide.

As individuals, however, would it not be well for us if we were to lead a less complex life and wander less far from the God of Nature from whence we came? Supposing we were to insist on using hand-made goods, in our food, clothing, furniture, and buildings, another race of craftsmen would spring up, much would be done to stay the depopulation of the country, the congestion of the towns, and the defiling of much beauty—and look at it which way we will, and be we of what religion we may, man has no right to soil the beauty of God's handiwork.

Supposing we were in reason to seek after hardness rather than luxury and ease—but why waste time in vain conjectures? Prophets have arisen in these latter days, and if we have not stoned them their words have but tickled the outer ear and fallen upon barren soil.

REGINALD NEWTON WEEKES.

GIOTTO IN MODERN LIFE

THE life-work of a great artist may be approached from two different points of view. We may make it our aim to detach ourselves, as far as is possible, from the peculiar or accidental conditions of the age and country we live in, and, taking our stand upon the ground of common humanity—the identity of the human spirit in all ages—we may attempt to determine its permanent and intrinsic worth. Or else we may address ourselves to a narrower, yet hardly less important question, and consider whether it has any special bearing upon human life as we know it; whether it exhibits qualities likely to give it a more than ordinary interest or value to the society or nation to which we ourselves belong. It is our purpose in the present article to approach the work of Giotto with the latter end in view; and we shall therefore do well to admit unreservedly at the outset that this second aim or method implies the first. We wish to set up a relation between what is permanent on one side, what is temporary on the other: and we cannot do this till we have emancipated ourselves from the tyranny that the temporary conditions impose. These conditions operate like a refracting atmosphere, and distort the true shape of the object: they enter, unawares, into the mind and give a bias to all its observations: it cannot see anything that transcends them, because, unconsciously, it introduces them into everything that it sees. To relate ourselves truly to the object, we must first distinguish the object from ourselves.

It is the recognition of this truth which has dictated the somewhat stern spirit of strictly scientific criticism which prevails in art circles to-day. The kind of appreciation commonly accorded to works of art is treated with suspicion, and not without cause. The suspicion is, that pictures frequently give pleasure by virtue of qualities they do not possess, and are hardly ever admired most for the qualities which really make them conspicuous. The enthusiastic but misdirected eulogies of the crowd chill the heart of the more discriminating observer, and freeze the current of his praise. He stands before a work of art and admits little pleasure, less emotion, content to call attention in a dry, technical phraseology to the unfamiliar minutiæ of palette craft and brushwork. Yet no one knows

better than himself that those minutiæ are means, not ends, and that in a truly artistic comprehension they must be merged, if not ignored. The fact is that our whole attitude to art and particularly to the art of painting is characterised by a pervading atmosphere of artificiality and constraint. The interest taken by the public in pictures is enormously on the increase, but as a public interest it is hardly two generations old, and does not as yet stand securely on its feet. In this it may be compared with a still more recent outburst, the revival of the cult of St. Francis. A very slight acquaintance with the English neo-Franciscans serves to show that there is a certain uneasiness in their camp: they eye one another with mutual distrust, each suspecting that the rest are not quite genuine in their devotion. And it follows in consequence—our national character is so strange—that those who care much for St. Francis conceal their feeling, and those who care little give exaggerated expression to the feeling they know themselves to lack. The same kind of exaggeration, either in excess or defect, determines, in general, our attitude to works of art; it seems as if we could not be quite sincere either with ourselves or with them, as if it were more than we could do to see them in their natural light. Mr. Sturge Moore made a powerful protest lately against the unnecessary and injurious narrowness of modern art-criticism in his appreciative life of Dürer: and yet the general upshot of that work cannot have been quite what he wished it to be. It was the work, if we may so express it, of an expatriated Spartan: the restrictions which Mr. Moore discarded had their revenge upon him, and expressed themselves spitefully by leading him into the contrary excess.

The cause of this curious play at cross-purposes is deeply seated in the national life. It affects other than the specifically artistic instincts. An interesting example of its operation occurred in the course of the recent agitation for the national purchase of Aira Force. One of our leading literary men—I fancy it was the Poet Laureate himself—in addressing a company, brought together, we may presume, by common love of nature, told them how in the heat of an election contest he had retired to that secluded spot, and how while his ears were ringing with the jarring notes of human strife his spirit had found refreshment there in the mute music of nature and solitude. This method of approaching the matter seemed irrelevant to the British mind; the audience was disquieted, as if afraid the speaker was about to confess he had composed a poem there; it needed Sir Wilfrid Lawson to get up, and assure them that he was a Westmorland man and knew the district well—that he had often scrambled up the Force when he was a boy and had cracked jokes and nuts there—not less than this was needed to convince the company that the place was after all a healthy one, untainted by the Muse, and

that, in spite of its poetic associations, there was no reason why it should be converted into a rubbish heap.

Of course, beauty and the intimacy of the emotions aroused by it are subjects which could never be dealt with from the platform without very considerable tact; yet it would be a mistake to suppose that it is only at our public meetings that such subjects are tabooed. A keen appreciation of beauty and the delicate sensibility that goes with it are among the most dangerous gifts an Englishman can have, dangerous because so rare. There is every chance that a nature richly endowed in this respect will develop fantastically and end by bringing its highest faculty into disrepute. It has even been questioned whether sensitiveness of this kind should not be allowed to be a law to itself, whether it is not presumption, pharisaism, sacrilege, on the part of the humdrum average we call society to dictate to so rare a spirit its common code of decency and order. Such questions can only be asked seriously in passing moments of sympathetic extravagance. But we touch a problem of serious and enduring significance when we ask how far society must accept responsibility for the ruin and abuse which, once it has come about, cannot be treated except as criminal, but which, in a society where artistic genius was understood and valued at its proper worth, could never have come about at all. The fact seems to be that the perception of beauty, being a highly elaborate and complex function, is peculiarly liable to detach itself from the main stream of our consciousness, and to behave anarchically; at its worst it seems definitely to aim at subverting the judgments and activities to which we are determined by other functions, such as the moral and religious; functions no less complex than itself, but better, because more continuously, related to the common conduct of life. All our faculties undoubtedly possess this power of detachment, or rather are subject to this calamity. They may set up within the individual a separate centre of individuality, and make two men of him instead of one; indeed, a completely unified personality is so rare as to be remarked on whenever it is observed. Now nothing tends so much to provoke this kind of mental insubordination as the possession of a bent or faculty foreign to the normal equipment of surrounding society, the recognition of a class of truths to which others appear blind. Eccentricity springs usually from self-conceit, and the fact that such self-conceit may be well founded, may merit the better name of self-assertion, may approach or even overpass the border line that separates self-assertion from the gift of prophecy, does not save its victim from a violent one-sidedness hardly distinguishable from mania. We recognise this in the life of one of our greatest artists, William Blake. Blake's conception of art, and of the relation of art to society, was comprehensive and profound; but it was in an alien, unresponsive world that the fire of his conviction had been

kindled, where it had no choice but to prey upon itself; therefore, instead of expanding into a warm and generous glow, it shrank to a solitary gleam of piercing and almost perilous light. The normal English attitude to beauty seems to be determined by an unconscious recognition of this anarchic tendency of the æsthetic consciousness. The staid and steady Britisher is never surprised to find that an artist is a mountebank. He may shrug his shoulders when he hears of Whistler's worst extravagances, and think he pushed whimsicality somewhat too far; but he expects extravagance from an artist, and though he heartily dislikes it in all its manifestations, is content to tolerate them and the worship of beauty, by which he supposes them dictated, so long as they keep their distance, and do not obviously intrude themselves upon the proprieties of his more sober life. But, that the sobriety and propriety of his life is in any sense answerable for this extravagance and whimsicality has never crossed his mind. He hates anarchy in all its forms, and forgets that it is not a natural but a reactionary growth. To treat it with ignominy, or to attempt to stamp it out, is to provide it precisely with those conditions in which, and in which only, it can thrive.

It is because of this natural antipathy or distrust, with which we eye the devotees of art and beauty, that the work of Giotto has, or might have, a peculiar significance for us in England at the present time. If we were living in a country where religion had so far fallen into neglect that the religious instinct could no longer express itself among us naturally, but either remained quiescent or else vaunted itself in a wanton luxuriance of asceticism, we should do well to turn, for an antidote, to the life of a man whose religious genius had developed, not at the expense of his other faculties, but by permeating them and drawing strength and substance from them; a man whose ideal was lofty and intense, not because he had restricted and refined it, but because he had laid for it so large and generous a foundation that it rose as if by natural right and lifted itself without effort into the heaven of heavens. We have need of such an example less in the religious than in the artistic world, and for such an example there is none to whom we can better turn than to Giotto; he is acknowledged on all hands to have been among the greatest, perhaps himself the very greatest artist the world has seen, but his specific faculty, his æsthetic consciousness, never lost touch with the sum of those other faculties, both of heart and mind, which in their due subordination, combination, interaction, produce an article of higher value than any artistic excellence—a sane, strong, noble manhood. It is because Giotto was first of all a man, and rose to the height of fame without the smallest sacrifice of the principles and practice that govern happy human life, because he pursued beauty not as an abstraction to be secured by discarding alien matter, but as an organic principle to which nothing could be alien, everywhere discoverable by those

who have eyes to see it; it is for these reasons that the work he has left behind him, primitive as it is, unlovely as is the condition to which time and vandalism have reduced it, remains and will remain an inexhaustible treasure house, a unique pattern for all who look to art not as to a toy prepared for the amusement of artificial sensibilities, but for revelation, as from a loftier level, of the true meaning and reality that underlie the experience of every day—for a view of life more comprehensive than the normal and therefore more profound.

We do not, on the whole, conceive thus seriously of art in England at the present day; a suitable appreciation of the acknowledged masterpieces is part of the equipment of a gentleman; 'society' is interested in the beautiful, and it is necessary to be able to say something intelligible about it; and so we read art books and hang reproductions of our favourite Madonnas upon our walls. But how many of us recognise that a just development of the æsthetic consciousness is a necessary element as well in the national as in the individual character, and that as long as we fail to apprehend the facts of beauty in their bearing upon practical life, so long our practical life itself is insecurely founded: that we are attempting to set up the mansion of our prosperity, while neglecting one of the materials essential to all sound construction? Such appreciation of art as we possess must indeed remain worse than useless to us until we are able instinctively to relate it to the conduct of practical life. Our national genius is for practice, and for the tactful common sense by which high abstract ideals can be accommodated to practice and to the concrete limitations thereby imposed. We could extend this accommodating genius to the realm of the beautiful if once we came to appreciate the value, the necessity of doing so. But, at present, we prefer to leave art and beauty without the pale, and to view them as fascinating but dangerous ideals, not seeing that the danger we shrink from, and even the fascination, is of our own making, and results from our refusal to bring the faculties, by which we apprehend them, into healthy relation with the faculties which govern conduct—faculties of which we have less reason to be afraid, because by constant exercise we keep them sane. We need to study Giotto.

One of the characteristics that strikes us first about Giotto is his consoling straightforwardness. Most artists, we suspect, are oversubtle; they take a subject, they set out ostensibly to paint one thing, while all the while intending to paint another. We, in our innocence, are deceived by them; we note the name of a picture, *Virgin and Child*, and we assume that the artist who composed it wished to present us with his idea of the Mother of Christ. It is only by slow degrees that we discover our mistake. And the discovery leaves us uncomfortable. In the work of Giotto there is no such discovery to be made. In his attitude to his subject he is as ingenuous as a

child, and what he wished to paint any child who knows the Bible story has but to look at his picture to find out. This is a stumbling-block to modern criticism; for when once the weapons of subtlety have been devised, the temptation to use them is irresistible. But it is artists themselves who are primarily to blame for the confusion. They choose their subjects for the most part with as little regard for the essential character of the event or situation they profess to be depicting, as children playing nursery games. The scene in which Elisha curses the children who mocked him was a favourite among us for dramatic presentation when I was a boy. We failed fully to appreciate the dignity of the prophet, but we realised the magnificent opportunity of violence afforded by impersonation of the two she-bears. Not that the presence of Elisha was wholly purposeless; without it the play must have degenerated into a common every-day performance, instead of sanctifying the drama for Sunday use; nor could there have been the same occasion for that peculiar venom which was allowed to be pardonable in bears summoned to execute a prophet's command. The history of art—of sacred art in particular—illustrates the same position over and over again; and the result has been a serious mystification of people, who, like ourselves, are naturally more susceptible of religious than of artistic truth. We have perceived dimly before a picture, such as Titian's great *Assumption*, that there were qualities in it that seemed not perfectly in keeping with a religious imagination of the event, and, conscious only of the immense reputation of the artist, have been content to acquiesce in his performance, and believe that the work before us was a true example of religious vision, a vision tempered or transformed —so we have conjectured—by the unknown necessities of artistic presentation. If, then, while our appreciation of the picture has been conventional, the distrust underlying that appreciation has been genuine, need we be surprised that the latter has proved the determining feature in our practical attitude to the art?

Our natural susceptibility to religious truth acts not to our confusion, but to our enlightenment, when we approach the study of Giotto. The subjects with which he deals are religious, and our simple-hearted belief that the essential qualities of sacred art are to be sought in the associations that make it sacred, suffers no harsh treatment at Giotto's hands. Great art consists in the perfect adaptation of finite means to infinite ends; and the true appreciation of it depends not so much upon the power to analyse and admire the ingenuity which secured that adaptation as upon communion in understanding of the end and in the desire for it. Thus it is that a purely secular appreciation of Giotto is an impossibility, whereas a mind in which the life or the ideal of Christ is in possession of the future as well as of the past, is already half-way advanced towards the essentially artistic apprehension of the meaning of Giotto's work.

It is on this account that the study of Giotto must have a peculiar value for the English mind, directing it automatically to a recognition of the function of beauty in a serious and sober manhood. Giotto, like Milton, had learnt to 'measure life betimes'; he was no mere artist in that restricted sense in which we commonly use the word; he knew 'toward solid good what leads the nearest way'; he was a philosopher and a man of action. Born in England at the present time, he would soon have set aside the notion of devoting himself exclusively to art; he would have refused to waste his talent in work which his countrymen would only half appreciate and half disdain. Rather we should imagine him, like Milton, an artist with one hand, a politician with the other, a great portrait painter and a great reformer, leaving to posterity a priceless record of the thought and feature of his distinguished colleagues in the Cabinet or in the House of Commons. In any case he would have been, as indeed he was, a man whom the mightiest must meet on equal terms, or not at all. For the fact that Giotto was born under a happier star, in a country and at a time when there was everything to encourage, nothing to check, the development of his artistic power, had not the effect of cramping or stultifying the development of his nature upon other lines. He rose to greatness upon the irresistible wave of religious enthusiasm which followed in the wake of that world-shaker St. Francis; and, riding himself upon the billow's very crest, while the gathered strength of it nerved his hand and fired his heart, he anticipated the perils of its career and saw the sunken reef on which its weight and volume must go to wreck and lose themselves at last in foam. In an age when religious enthusiasm had over-reached itself, he maintained a perfect balance of mind, identifying himself so intimately with all that was vital in the Franciscan teaching that his version of the sacred story has all the grandeur and simplicity of a fifth gospel; and yet preserving so natural an interest, so generous a sympathy in contemporary life in all its forms, as to be the chosen companion of poet, priest, and king.

In Giotto, as in Dante, the fibre, the gathered strength of the sturdy Florentine stem breaks gloriously into flower; and the flower is of the rarest and most perfect that ever blossomed on the tree of humanity. It is at Florence, in the shadow of the great Campanile, that our thoughts turn naturally to Giotto. And there, indeed, we may find many a trace surviving of his power and influence in the exquisite sculptured reliefs on the bell-tower itself, in the sublime and tragic history of St. John the Baptist on the old bronze doors of the Baptistery. But Giotto, the painter, appears at Florence under a cloud. There are not more than two frescoes remaining in which the qualities really characteristic of his work make themselves immediately felt; in the rest they can only be inferred after a tedious process of study, for which the normal traveller has neither patience

nor time to spare. And perhaps only one monument exists where, above the ruin and desolation wrought by time and by restorers, the image of this grand old Titan still rises unsubdued; and this, unhappily, is at Padua, a city, indeed, of wonderful charm and beauty, but cast into comparative shade by the dazzling pre-eminence of her too near neighbour Venice. The decoration of the Arena Chapel at Padua, though it belongs only to Giotto's middle period, and lacks the reconciling grace which he infused into his later and more perfect work, remains incontestably the grandest existing expression in art, not only of the Gospel story, but of the faith of Christendom. Yet it receives only the scantiest recognition. When I last studied there in the winter of 1903–4, for five days consecutively my companion and myself were the only visitors to the chapel. The sacristan explained to us that there was nothing unusual in this experience, and that the impression left upon the more enterprising travellers, who followed their guide-books to the 'Arena,' was generally an impression of disappointment not unmixed with indignation, or even with disdain. Here is the curse of Venice. At Padua you are already inside the ring of magnetic attraction which surrounds the city of the sea; you are either anticipating already its atmosphere of ease and ecstasy or you are breathing it in retrospect and in regret; the spirit is oppressed by Giotto's sterner, more vigorous mountain air. But at Florence these very frescoes, over which you cast now a languid depreciatory eye, would rouse and thrill you; you would return to them again and again, you would see them in a true perspective and would appreciate at last the towering eminence of that Atlas mind which in the morning-tide of Christian art brought heaven and earth together.

The tide of specialist criticism is setting, momentarily, in a direction unfavourable to just recognition of the highest and grandest qualities of Giotto's genius. A movement of great interest is in progress, from which valuable results are to be expected, in the form of permanent contributions to the range of our knowledge. The desire to concentrate attention upon the abstract essence, by virtue of which art is art, to analyse and define the formal principle, in which all arts agree, the tendency even to suspect the validity of an artistic appreciation which over-rides these narrow restraints—these represent the main current of contemporary criticism. It argues no lack of appreciation either of the aim or the methods of this criticism to point out that, while thus pursuing the essence, as an abstraction, it is in danger of losing sight of the wider significance, the humaner aspects of the great subject with which it has proposed to deal. The distinguishing feature—the central essential quality which differentiates fine art and the love of it from all other forms of human activity and appreciation—is likely to be something delicate and elusive, and to defy easy formulation. In the meantime art depends, for its

value, as always, not merely upon this abstraction or the recognition of it, but upon the larger life, the universal interests, in which it plays its part, and without which it could have no part to play. It is, in fact, a partial, an imperfect, criticism which pursues the element of difference or separation. In a just appreciation this element is seen to be inseparable from the presuppositions, the foundations, that unify and set it in relation with the life of which it is an expression. Whatever value art possesses, it possesses only as part of a whole and in relation to the whole of which it is a part. It could have no meaning and no existence otherwise. There is a likelihood, therefore, that the greatest artists will be those in whose work this relativity is most conspicuous, who in their artistic achievement have laid themselves most whole-heartedly under contribution to the age and society they live in, and have attained the most perfect fusion of their artistic with all their other faculties. The greatest art will be that in which the formative principle of beauty appears not in any pride of isolation but as a reconciling, harmonising power, aiming at no crude self-assertion, but by submission vanquishing every alien element and asserting itself at last in a triumphant union with the entire armament of the soul. Giotto's art was of this calibre. We are sometimes told that the art of painting has not, in strictness, anything to do with an external world, with the familiar appearances of objects, with events as they happen in time or space. That it is something far removed from such banalities, and dwells in an invisible palace of its own building, founded upon the void: that if artists have taken upon themselves to tell stories now and then, they have forfeited their birthright by so doing, and made concessions to the grossness of humanity; they have acted not as artists, but as mere men, and if the artistic quality of their work has not been sacrificed altogether, they have retained it in their own despite. And rightly to admire the beauty of their achievement we must banish from our minds all thought of the event with which they have foolishly associated and encumbered it; we must follow not the story they think they have to tell, but those eternal verities to which all artists worth the name bear witness in every lightest touch upon the canvas or upon the wall.

Giotto's work rejects this kind of abstract, idealistic appreciation. If it is beautiful, its beauty is of a kind inextricably interwoven with the deeper significance, be it of legend or history, which the artist has used it to express and to reveal. Giotto recounts the Gospel narrative in pictures which every Christian child may understand: it is a pity all our children are not familiar with them. And is he less an artist on that account? Here, rather, is the culmination of his greatness; and here, too, is the quality which above all other qualities of his genius recommends him to our serious consideration to-day. We do not all conceive of the great story just as he did. But at the

least we recognise in the Gospels qualities which give them a unique place both in history and in literature; we recognise that if they are not at the centre of our culture, and do not contain the principle of our progress, yet we cannot point to anything more central, more essential, than they. Giotto's work appeals to us with all the simplicity and freshness, all the depth and grandeur, which make the Gospels sacred and sublime. It brings these high realities before us vivified, transfused by that warmth of imagination, whose issue we call beauty. Under the influence of this beauty the great past lives and breathes again, an animate presence to which the spirit has no choice but to respond.

Physical science has been at some pains recently to come to an understanding with itself and others as regards its attitude to religious belief, and the result has been a formal recognition—highly gratifying to minds in which the true relative positions of religion and science were inversed—of the credibility of certain contested tenets. With much seriousness, tinged perhaps with condescension, science has accorded them its papal *imprimatur*. They received a different and a more congenial ratification six hundred years ago. Giotto painted the *Nativity*, the *Crucifixion*, the *Ascension* in a spirit so perfectly accordant with the profound significance attaching to these great Christian beliefs, equally whether we regard them as historically or poetically true, that, as we stand in the Arena Chapel, we realise once and for all that their truth, however we choose to explain or to define it, is here made manifest, revealed, endorsed. They have been proved in the mint of a new mind, and have returned from it, as they passed into it, pure gold. We forget the mechanism by which the metal was fused, or stamped, or moulded; we forget whether it is the spirit of art or of religion before which we bow. It is a new experience. We had heard it by hearing of the ear, but now the eye seeth it. Here, in the clear mirror of lofty imagination, Christ ascends in flesh and in spirit before our eyes; the earth we tread on becomes an earth we share with Him.

Art can achieve no greater thing than this, yet Giotto's art achieved no less. And if the human spirit is, indeed, a unity, then the faculty which raised it and rose with it to this summit of grandeur is one which at our peril we treat with suspicion or with disdain. We are not men without it, our vaunted efficiency is not four-square; our calculations are incomplete till they allow its proper weight to a factor of such tremendous power and consequence. The influence of beauty is a lever of inestimable force, and if we think to dispense with the use of it, it will not lie idle. Sever its connection with the machinery with which it should harmonise and interact, and sooner or later it is transformed into an instrument of destruction. Giotto was, as it were, a host in himself. He must have been a leader in

whatever age he had been born; but, for the most part, the agencies by which great art is brought to birth are under the control, not of the artist, but of the society to which he belongs. We are all members one of another, and it is at once the greatness and the weakness of the artistic temperament that, above all others, it finds self-knowledge, self-revelation, in self-surrender.

BASIL DE SÉLINCOURT.

A TEMPERANCE TOWN

In one of the theatres of Boston, Massachusetts, a play bearing the above title has been before the public for some considerable time. The plot is good and the situations are marked by a great deal of genuine pathos and humour, but the drama also owes its popularity to a definite and undoubted trend in popular opinion, for it is written with a distinct bias against the objects and methods of the more extreme Temperance reformers in the United States. The motive of the play is largely to demonstrate, by a succession of ludicrous and pathetic incidents, the absolutely unreal character of prohibition in a town where the sale of liquor is forbidden by the State law. Little effort, of course, is made to give a fair hearing to the claims put forward by the Temperance party that very real benefits have accrued from State prohibition. On the other hand, contempt and ridicule are freely lavished on the manifest failures, hypocrisies, and subterfuges which meet one at every turn in a 'temperance town' like Portland, Bangor, or Lewiston.

The Maine elections which were held in September of the present year were characterised by an amount of excitement and interest almost unprecedented in the history of the State. Maine in general and Cumberland county in particular had been for years a stronghold of Republicanism, but in September an amazing change came over the political scene. The majority in favour of the Republican governor, Mr. Cobb, sank from 26,816, in 1904, to 9,000—a loss of no fewer than 17,816 votes—while the county in which Portland is situated, always on former occasions safely relied upon to furnish a Republican majority of 2,000, now bestowed its allegiance on the Democratic party, and returned a Democratic sheriff, Mr. W. M. Pennell, by a largely increased majority. The explanation of this astonishing reversal of popular sentiment forms a most interesting chapter in the history of the Temperance movement. It marks a culminating point in the long, dreary struggle of the Maine towns against the coercion of the country districts, and is full of warning to practical politicians of our own country in view of the promised Temperance legislation of 1907.

For nearly half a century prohibition in Portland had been little else than a name. One Republican sheriff after another had allowed

a large number of saloons to remain open and carry out a sale of liquor which was technically illegal. At intervals the keepers of these saloons were summoned before the magistrates and fined, but, owing to the low tone of morality which sometimes seems inseparable from the political life of the United States, the heavy fines inflicted upon the offenders found their way chiefly into the pockets of the sheriffs and their official colleagues. Some five years ago, however, a minister of religion, Mr. Pearson, succeeded to the office of sheriff and made desperate efforts to enforce the State prohibition law. Raids, fines, and imprisonments were of constant occurrence, the drink traffic was for the time being apparently suppressed, and to outward view the saloons were closed. But what really happened? A careful investigation conducted by officials revealed the startling fact that during the *régime* of the parson-sheriff drink could be procured in more than four hundred places spread over seventy-two streets in Portland alone!

At this point the work of Sheriff Pennell commenced. Mr. Pennell is a man in the prime of life, an unceasing worker, full of enthusiasm for every good cause and of irreproachable character in public and private life. He cordially disliked the hypocrisy of putting the drink traffic out of sight and pretending that it did not exist. At the same time he realised the very patent fact that the citizens of Maine were in permanent rebellion against the coercion forced upon them by the country districts, and intended by foul means or fair to secure a certain amount of liquor for their consumption.

The outcome of the sheriff's reflections was the 'Pennell Plan.' Under this system some thirty saloons—selected because their business was respectably conducted—were allowed to sell liquor in Portland. Certain wholesome restrictions as to hours of sale and so on were rigorously enforced by the sheriff and accepted by the saloon-keepers, who had the fear of arrests and fines always before their eyes, and quite understood that any violation of the tacit understanding would result in the immediate infliction of the heavy penalties provided by the existing law. The fines so inflicted at more or less regular intervals formed in practice a very considerable sum of money. But the revenue from this informal 'High Licence' did not, as in the old Republican days, find its way into the pockets of various officials; it was simply placed in the municipal treasury and used for general purposes. Such a system was on the face of it very imperfect; the enraged prohibitionists who denounced Sheriff Pennell as 'violating his oath of office' or 'nullifying the law' were technically justified in their criticisms, and the thought that a public treasury was being enriched from the proceeds of direct illegality was not, even in America, a very comfortable one. Nevertheless, we must remember that the sheriff had to make the most of his material. He had no possible interest in the prosperity of the liquor sellers, upon whom the burden

of the High Licence levy fell quite impartially and quite irrespective of their political views. At the same time it is worth noticing that the saloon-keepers stated on more than one occasion that they preferred the Pennell system to the old lax methods of the Republican sheriffs, because the levies made upon them for the private benefit of former sheriffs and other officials were really more burdensome than those exacted from them by Sheriff Pennell and added to the public funds.

The Pennell saloons were few in number, quiet, well conducted, and, as a rule, situated in the less prominent parts of the town. They were quite unlike the glittering and attractive gin-palaces often found in communities where 'High Licence' is the only law. And when any ardent prohibitionist in England is tempted to condemn Sheriff Pennell's 'pious fraud' he or she must not forget that under this system the saloons in Portland were reduced to thirty, *i.e. one drinking place to two thousand of the population*—a condition of things beyond the wildest dreams of any licensing justice in England. The sheriff carried out his scheme with unflinching courage and impartiality, and the whole community of Maine was filled with amazement when, some two years ago, the agent of the Portland Liquor Agency (which was always permitted to sell alcohol for 'medicinal or mechanical purposes') was suddenly arrested on a charge of illegal selling. The case was perfectly clear. 'Martini Cocktails' and other American drinks had been sold in a reckless fashion by the agent, Mr. Douglas, under the transparent alias of 'medicines,' just as the lonely officer on the South African blockhouse lines occasionally secured a few half-bottles of champagne under the *nom de guerre* of 'medical comforts.' Mr. Douglas, however, died before the date fixed for his trial, and the Republican newspapers, to their shame, actually denounced Sheriff Pennell as the 'murderer' of the agent!

The 'Pennell Plan' had been in force for more than a year when the sheriff's term of office expired. The Republicans were full of hope. They had used every effort to interfere with the smooth working of the system in vogue. Members of the police force who were in sympathy with the Republican party had exerted themselves to the utmost in order to arrest as many drunkards as possible and thus help to prove that the method adopted by the Democratic sheriff was a fruitful source of increased drunkenness. Hitherto, for example, no policeman had ever arrested an intoxicated person who, without creating disorder, had retired to his own house, but these political zealots now took to invading the homes of alcoholic citizens and haled the offenders before the municipal court. The sheriff very soon saw through this manœuvre, and quietly informed all whom it might concern that if this abnormal number of arrests continued he should be compelled to close summarily those saloons from which the drunkards procured their liquor. This clever intimation had the desired

effect, and the sanctity of the inebriate home was for the future respected by the Republican policemen. Pulpit influence, too, was exerted against the return of the sheriff. Various prohibitionist ministers publicly denounced the wickedness of an official who was described as a 'law-breaker in high places,' and the help of Heaven was invoked to end the mischievous career of an 'official perjurer.' Undeterred by any menace from this world or the next, Sheriff Pennell took a step very unusual in the case of those who had aspired to or actually occupied his office. He addressed a series of public meetings. Such a course of action would have been singularly embarrassing to the long series of his Republican predecessors, whose fiscal relations with the 'prohibited' liquor shops were not regarded as altogether suitable for publication. At former elections as a rule the sheriff asked for prohibition votes, but as regards any details of the liquor administration he maintained a discreet silence. But now Sheriff Pennell frankly took the people into his confidence, described the enormous difficulties of the situation, and simply asked them to decide whether they preferred his system of technical illegality and straightforward finance, or the open hypocrisy and personal blackmail of former days. The people of Portland answered his question with no uncertain voice, and re-elected Sheriff Pennell with a largely increased majority over his Republican opponent, who had fought as the avowed supporter of 'prohibition.'

And now begins a new act in the serio-comedy of the Maine legislation. The Republicans were beside themselves with indignation and disappointment, and the party machinery was set in motion in order to check and, if possible, render futile the democratic methods of Sheriff Pennell. A conference of Republicans was held at Augusta, and, as a result of their deliberations, the already over-loaded statute-book of Maine—there had been already some sixty amendments of the liquor laws since their inception in 1846—was enriched by two fresh ordinances, the 'Sturgis Commission' and the 'Oakes Law.' The duty imposed upon the commissioners was this: they could enter any county in Maine where the prohibitory law was not adequately enforced, and could take that law out of the sheriff's hands and see to its enforcement themselves, and thus incidentally deprive the delinquent county of such revenues as might accrue from the infliction of fines for the sale of alcohol. The Oakes Law formed a kind of drastic corollary to the Commission, for it decreed various pains and penalties, extending even to imprisonment, against any sheriff who neglected his duty of suppressing the liquor traffic.

The third and last act of our liquor drama brings up the story to the present month. The instructions of the Commission and the Oakes Law, though drawn up in general terms, were manifestly directed against Cumberland county. The audacious sheriff, who had successfully defied all the forces of the Republican party, was

to be humiliated in his own city, and perhaps punished into the bargain. But once more the Republicans underrated the extraordinary cleverness and energy of their opponent. Before the Sturgis commissioners could descend upon the offending county and the Oakes Law fall in vengeance upon official neglect, Sheriff Pennell, with that happy audacity which characterises the successful leader of men, decreed that 'henceforth Cumberland county is to be dry,' and, adds a local newspaper, 'the dryness which ensued was the very dryness of Sahara.' Never in living memory has the prohibitory law been enforced with greater severity than at present. When Sir Thomas Whittaker visited Portland some three years ago he found a considerable number of saloons situated in well-known streets and easily accessible. One may walk to-day from one end of Portland to the other without seeing any open sale of beer or whisky; the hotels no longer supply visitors with surreptitious drink, and the city liquor agency is conducted with a most rigid regard for the spirit as well as the letter of the law. 'You insist on my carrying out the law,' says the sheriff, in effect, to his Republican opponents. 'Very well, then, carry out the law I will, but it shall be an honest and rigorous enforcement. I will deal impartially with all the saloons, and no money shall find its way into private pockets. The citizens of Portland can then see for themselves what a genuine enforcement of the law means, and can at the next election decide for themselves whether they will simply continue the existing methods forced upon them by the Republican party, or vote that the whole vexed question shall be resubmitted to the electorate.' The fairness and manly straightforwardness of the sheriff have appealed powerfully to the citizens, and the discomfited Republicans have realised that they have fallen into the ditch which they prepared for another.

'Resubmission,' then, is to be the test question at the next election. All that the sheriff and his friends ask is that the people of Maine shall once more decide for themselves the question whether prohibition shall prevail throughout the State or local option be accorded to the various districts so that they may deal with the liquor traffic as they think best. It is surely a reasonable demand. In Scandinavia the licensing question is resubmitted to the electorate every seven years, and the citizens of Portland, Bangor, and other towns ask why they should be irrevocably bound by a regulation drawn up a quarter of a century ago? The question of 'Resubmission' is, of course, a very serious one in Maine, for the prohibitory ordinance is actually a part of the constitution of that State, and, in order to alter any portion of the constitution, a two-thirds majority is required in the legislature. This then is to be the all-important question at the next election—'Resubmission' or the *status quo ante*. The prohibitionist party, which includes many men and women of high character and social standing, resolutely refuses to countenance any re-opening of the

question. The attitude of such a citizen as Colonel Neal Dow, the *grandson of the well-known General,* "*the father of the Maine prohibition law,' is quite clear and intelligible. He would maintain that* he and his friends are perfectly satisfied with the existing law, that they appreciate its benefits and have no desire for any change. The onus therefore of agitating for 'Resubmission' cannot reasonably be expected to fall upon them. If the malcontents agitate for resubmission, the prohibitionists cannot help them and may justifiably oppose them. What underlies this pronouncement is probably a serious misgiving prompted by the contemplation of the many American States which have formerly accepted prohibition and subsequently discarded it for local option.

The enforcement of the prohibition law is, as I have already said, carried out at present in Portland with a thoroughness and severity hitherto unknown. Raids, arrests, and fines are the *crambe repetita* of the police-court annals, no open saloon exists, the Liquor Agency is altogether above suspicion, and no hotel will, under any pretext, furnish the visitor with any form of intoxicant. Nevertheless, what do we find? A few weeks ago I visited Portland, and after dinner at my hotel, took a walk with a friend through the town. At 8.30 a successful police raid was directed against the Atwood Café in Center Street. Fifty dozen bottles of Budweiser beer and several dozens of 'Bass' were captured and removed in patrol waggons. About 10 o'clock I asked a young man who appeared to be in charge of the restaurant if I could get a glass of beer, and he said that he would have been delighted to accommodate me, but every bottle of beer had been removed in the raid. This young person appeared to be quite cheerful; he seemed to regard his losses as the fortune of war, and the restaurant had probably realised considerable profits on previous sales. Leaving this optimist, we soon afterwards reached a doorway which somehow suggested alcohol. I entered, and on passing through an inner door found myself in an ordinary bar, with the familiar white handles ranged along its inner side. Placing five cents on the counter, I was promptly served with a glass of beer. Half a dozen other men were drinking; and, while I was inside, breaking the law in order to gain information, a powerfully-built man, who stood at the end of the room, handed over flasks of whisky to several disreputable-looking individuals, who entered the bar quickly and as quickly disappeared. These men are known as 'pocket pedlars,' and sell spirits—most of it fiery and maddening stuff—at exorbitant prices to customers whom they chance to meet. Before reaching our hotel we were accosted several times by these peripatetic traders. As we continued our walk down this street, a well-known thoroughfare leading out of the main street, we saw four or five places where drink was evidently being purchased and consumed, and within the compass of an hour's walk, all told, we met at least twenty-

five drunken men and women. I next paid a visit to the police-station, where six 'drunks' had just been brought in, one of them a young artilleryman, and another a middle-aged woman. The former was disfigured from a blow which had cut open his eyebrow, and the woman screamed so loudly that one of the prisoners, who appeared less drunk than the rest, loudly complained that sleep was impossible. The four others lay like logs, stupefied by the vile spirits purchased from some 'dive,' 'kitchen bar,' or 'pocket pedlar.' On the previous day there had been fourteen arrests for drunkenness. Later in the afternoon four boys were brought in, then a man and his wife, then two women, one of whom was so maddened by drink that she dashed herself in frenzy against the iron bars, and had to be placed in the padded cell. As some slight diversion from this unsavoury scene, I accompanied the police in a raid upon a gambling den. Six of them, armed with bâtons and revolvers, made a concerted rush up some rickety steps, only to find that the Chinese inmates had received warning of our approach. No trace of dice or cards was visible, but on the floor sat a Chinese mother engaged in teaching her young child the sublime ethics of Confucius, and feeding it with 'chop-suey.' We left this pleasing picture of domestic tranquillity and returned to the police-station, where the 'drunks' had meanwhile been reinforced by two fresh arrivals. I was then shown a kind of subterranean museum of alcohol curiosities. There were boxes with false bottoms, refrigerators fitted up with small shelves for bottles, gas tubing, which wore an innocent look, but really conveyed liquor from some secret reservoir inside the wall, and so on. Next door was a cellar filled with captured bottles of beer and spirits, the contents of which were poured down a sink at the end of the room, while the bottles were sold to defray partly the cost of their capture. Here, too, was a watering-can, which had belonged to a family of a father, mother, and two children. First of all the father was convicted of selling liquor, and was soon liberated because the judge pitied the poor woman left alone to face the world without her bread-winner. Soon afterwards the woman was detected in further illicit disbursements from the watering-can. She was also let off in order that the poor children should not be left without a mother's care. Not long afterwards both father and mother were lodged in jail for a similar offence, and actually during their parents' imprisonment it was found that the two innocent children were busily engaged in selling whisky from the same receptacle!

Next morning sentence was passed on ten cases of intoxication, while three men charged with the illegal sale of liquor were remanded for a week, and one woman convicted of the same offence was fined 200 dollars. Nothing seems to deter some of these illegal vendors. In one case there have been no fewer than eighteen convictions in four years, and another inveterate offender has actually been punished

144 times since he first took up this nefarious traffic in 1870. The sentences on the drunks were by no means light. Two men and one woman received ninety days' imprisonment, two men and one woman were fined ten dollars (2*l.*) and costs, and the rest three dollars and costs. This, then, is the sort of police record for the town of Portland *at a time when the prohibition law is more drastically enforced than ever before. The net result is that during the week I was there no fewer than fifty-eight arrests for intoxication took place, and the average for the year actually amounts to between forty and fifty per week, which in a population of 60,000 works out for Portland to about forty per 1,000 inhabitants per annum—i.e.* three times as bad as our worst drinking centres, the seaport towns and mining counties, six times as bad as London, and nine times as bad as our manufacturing towns. According, also, to the last available statistics (1898–1899), the arrests at Bangor number forty-six per thousand, Augusta twenty-nine, Bath thirty-one, Lewiston twenty-nine, while Gardiner reaches the appalling total of sixty-nine per thousand! Such statistics cannot, it is true, be cited as absolutely conclusive evidence in these cases, for they do not cover all the ground, but, after all, they form practically all the available data we possess for comparisons between one town and another, and they certainly lend support to the view of practically every ordinary level-headed citizen one meets that the prohibition law is in many respects a hypocritical farce as far as the larger towns are concerned.

I have in the preceding notes dealt almost exclusively with the city of Portland, but it seems certain that the condition of some other towns in Maine is far worse. At Bangor it is perfectly easy to purchase drink, and at Lewiston the sale of alcohol from the laxly conducted agency amounts to something between twelve hundred and fifteen hundred dollars weekly! The Sturgis Commissioners have never paid a visit to Bangor, because—this seems to be the real explanation—the Republican party is strong at Bangor, and any interference with the citizens in the matter of greater liquor stringency might seriously imperil many thousands of Republican votes. The Oakes Law, too, which came in with a flourish of trumpets, is virtually dead. In no single instance have any proceedings been taken under it against any sheriff, deputy sheriff, or county attorney, 'who shall wilfully or corruptly refuse or neglect to perform his duties' under the prohibition law.

It is, of course, very difficult altogether to avoid personal bias in drawing conclusions from the evidence furnished by experiences in Maine. Take a recent example. During the last electoral campaign in Portland two Finnish gentlemen, one of whom was a Dr. Seppala, were commissioned by the authorities of the archduchy of Finland to investigate the working of the Maine law. They were, I believe, severely handicapped by their almost complete inability to

converse in English, but they consulted a number of representative citizens, and subsequently a letter was written by Dr. Seppala in which, in a somewhat rhetorical fashion, he eulogises the present Maine law. But the letter is, on the face of it, the work of a convinced prohibitionist, impervious to any antagonistic arguments, and it contains, amongst other things, a most unjustifiable innuendo that the sheriff is 'not very much against the business' of 'kitchen bars' and 'dives.' A short time after the departure of Dr. Seppala and his companion another Finnish deputation arrived on the scene, consisting of three gentlemen, Messrs. Schumann, Silacus, and Bostrom. These more recent envoys did not, it seems, make any serious effort to ascertain the views of the prohibitionist leaders in Portland, and the editor of the Portland *Evening Express* now claims to have discovered that the three Finns were despatched to Maine by a body of brewers and distillers as a kind of counterpoise to the teetotal delegates who preceded them. To this fact, if it be correct, some colour is undoubtedly lent by the exaggerated and one-sided report published in the *Daily Eastern Argus*. Prohibitionist claims are allowed no hearing whatever; the entire report is, indeed, nothing but a piece of special pleading against the enforcement of any prohibitory law. Take, for example, the following paragraph: 'We have visited saloons in Baltimore, New York, Newhaven, Hartford, Providence, Boston, and Manchester, and we can freely state that we have seen more "drunks" in Portland than in all those places put together.' Such a statement as this passes beyond the limits of ordinary exaggeration, and is simply grotesque in its falsity.

For my own part I can fairly claim that I did my best to hear both sides in this controversy. The utmost courtesy was extended to me by the official authorities at Portland from the sheriff downwards, and Colonel Neal Dow and other prohibitionists were equally ready in the midst of their busy days to afford me full and interesting information. In summary, then, it is clear, on the one hand, that the prohibition law in Maine has certain distinct advantages which cannot be lightly disregarded. To a very large extent it prevents the drink habit from being formed amongst the young men who have been decently brought up. It is no longer respectable to drink in public. No self-respecting citizen can possibly provide himself or his friend with a casual drink in any Portland street. The business man, clerk, or artisan is not confronted with that fatal facility of procuring liquor which is a curse to England; nor is the ordinary citizen in the course of a walk down the street able to 'warm himself' or 'cool himself'—according to the special pretext for alcohol furnished by the weather. Further, the inducement to drink offered by the pernicious free-lunch system of the American saloons is, of course, non-existent in Maine. The fact that the law is frequently violated is not an absolutely convincing argument against its wisdom.

Were this the case, there would be a good deal to say against the validity of almost every law, from the Decalogue to bicycle regulations.

On the other hand, I cannot help thinking that the benefits secured by the existing law are bought at too heavy a cost. Whatever may be claimed with respect to the better educated classes of society, it seems clear that amongst those members of the community less able to resist temptation, drunkenness is quite as rife in the towns of Maine as in non-prohibition areas. Nor must it be forgotten that any well-to-do citizen of Portland, Lewiston, or Bangor who belongs to a social club can quite easily drink a whisky and soda upon the premises whenever he cares to. And this easy evasion of the spirit of the prohibition ordinance really establishes the evil principle of 'One law for the rich and another for the poor.'

Again, the whole atmosphere of public feeling at Portland is charged with intense irritation. It seems certain that an overwhelming majority of the citizens are utterly opposed to the severity of the existing liquor laws. The towns realise that they are coerced by the country districts where—so it is said—the farmers easily store in their houses all the alcohol they need, have no pressing necessity for public saloons, and vote solidly for prohibition. Finally, the worst feature of the whole system is the low tone of public morality which seems to result from it. Hypocrisy is the keynote of the situation. Drink is prohibited, but drunkenness is horribly patent. The secretary of the Y.M.C.A. told Sir Thomas Whittaker three years ago that he had never seen a glass of spirits in Portland, and yet at that moment he could have walked into thirty saloons and purchased whisky over the counter in broad daylight. Unless the towns are fortunate enough to secure such honest and incorruptible officials as Sheriff Pennell, this hypocrisy translates itself into a recognised system of personal blackmail. Politics in Portland are, so to speak, saturated with alcohol; all other questions of social reform sink into insignificance, and are subordinated to the one all-absorbing topic—the conditions under which this municipal hypocrisy is to be carried on. The degradation of the whole system is felt very keenly by a large section of the most thoughtful citizens, and, as far as the 'Temperance Towns' are concerned, it is certain that at the first available opportunity an enormous majority of votes will be recorded for 'Resubmission.'

E. N. Bennett.

December 1906.

BEES AND BLUE FLOWERS

ACCORDING to what Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace has called 'Mr. Darwin's beautiful theory,' the world is indebted to the bee for the blue flower. Or, as Mr. Grant Allen expressed it, the flowers 'have become blue because blue is the favourite colour of bees.'

And there are few scientific theories which have enjoyed a wider popularity than this which ascribes the origin of flowers to the selective action of insects. Darwin expressed his view in the *Origin of Species* as follows :

> We may safely conclude that if insects had never existed on the face of the world the vegetation would not have been decked with beautiful flowers, but would have produced only such poor flowers as are now borne by our firs, oaks, nut and ash trees, by the grasses, by spinach, docks, and nettles.

The idea thus set forth was taken up and developed by popular writers and seized the public fancy in a remarkable way. It was not merely a scientific explanation, there was poetry in it—it was a 'beautiful theory.' The thought that insects by visiting the flowers for their own ends had, unconsciously, played the part of florists and produced for us the varied flowers of the fields and woods was a fascinating one. Lord Avebury has expressed it thus :

> As our gardeners, by selecting seed from the most beautiful varieties, have done so much to adorn our gardens, so have insects, by fertilising the largest and most brilliant flowers, contributed unconsciously, but not less effectually, to the beauty of our woods and fields.

A French writer, Théophile Gautier, has ventured on the assertion : 'Jamais les arbres verts n'ont essayé d'être bleus.'

But according to the above theory *green* plants have not only *tried* but succeeded—as regards their flowers—in becoming *blue*. And this in response to the solicitations of the bee.

The poetic side of the theory was largely developed in this country by the charming papers of Mr. Grant Allen. The evolution of the blue flower by the bee became a classic in the fairy tales of science. In one of Mr. Grant Allen's fascinating essays he explains the origin of the blue monk's-hood from a plain yellow flower like a buttercup. The story runs as follows: In the far-off past there was a plain

buttercup-like flower of a yellow colour. Let us call it a buttercup, although it could not be identified with any living species. To these buttercups the bees resorted for pollen and nectar. Now, amongst them there were some with a tinge of blue. These the bees *selected* for their visits. They were thus cross-fertilised and produced more numerous and vigorous offspring than those which were *not blue* and *not selected*. And in succeeding generations bluer and bluer flowers chanced to appear, and were selected by the bees in a similar way. Thus the yellow buttercup grew bluer and bluer. At the same time there were trifling variations in the *shape* of the flower. A petal in some was bent over to form a protection for the nectar. These were selected, and gradually in a similar way the hood of the monk's-hood was evolved. So with the other peculiarities in the shape of the flower. Then it chanced that a plant arose with more numerous flowers on one stem. This was immediately noticed and seized on by the bee. And as flowers appeared more closely grouped on a stem they continued to attract the bee by their greater conspicuousness, and were selected and benefited. At last appeared the tall spiked inflorescence of the monk's-hood with its closely set, blue-hooded flowers. Such is the story of the bee and the blue flower, told in less poetic language, but substantially the same as the more fascinating account of Mr. Grant Allen.

But there is a white variety of our common blue monk's-hood, and Darwin relates a curious fact about it.

> Dr. W. Ogle [he writes] has communicated to me a curious case. He gathered in Switzerland 100 flower stems of the common blue variety of the monk's-hood (*Aconitum Napellus*), and not a single flower was perforated; he then gathered 100 stems of a white variety growing close by, and every one of the open flowers had been perforated.

This shows, at least, that the *white* monk's-hood had been frequently visited by bees—it suggests that it may have been more visited than the blue.

And then there is a yellow species of monk's-hood (*Aconitum Vulparia*). Now, was this yellow monk's-hood derived from the blue or the blue from the yellow? Or perhaps we should rather say, Was their common ancestor yellow or blue? If the former, then where was the bees' taste for blue during the long ages when the yellow monk's-hood was being evolved from the buttercup? And if the bees' taste came later, how has the yellow monk's-hood remained yellow in spite of it? If, on the other hand, the common ancestor was blue, how could a yellow be derived from it by the 'azure-loving bee'? For it is to be remembered that monk's-hood is a typical bee flower in shape, both in the blue and yellow species.

The unappreciative Peter Bell saw nothing in the primrose but yellow:

> A primrose by the river's brim
> A *yellow* primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more.

The more appreciative bee saw in a plain yellow buttercup the possibilities of a blue monk's-hood. The siren song of floral evolution thus chanted has allured many a naturalist who has thrown himself into the sea of wild speculation and absurdity which has surged up round the story of the bee and the blue flower. Only here and there among them a Ulysses has bound himself to the mast of reason and common sense. But the sirens sing on, and the sea still claims its victims.

Mr. Grant Allen's bee is a lover of blue: no other bee could evolve a blue flower. What grounds are there, then, for supposing that blue is the favourite colour of bees? The belief that bees prefer blue, which forms so essential a part of the theory, is founded solely on certain experiments carried out by Lord Avebury. These experiments consisted in placing honey on slips of glass over paper of various colours, and noting carefully the visits of a particular bee, or several bees, to this honey. Now, the result of these observations showed, not that a bee visited the honey over the blue paper only, but that it paid a larger number of visits to this than to that over any one of the other colours. In fact, the experiments showed at the most only a somewhat limited and partial preference for blue on the part of the bee. A further criticism may be offered on Lord Avebury's remarks on his own experiments.

> I put some honey [he writes] on a piece of blue paper, and when a bee had made several journeys, and thus become accustomed to the blue colour, I placed some more honey in the same manner on orange paper about a foot away.

And again:

> Having accustomed a bee to come to honey on blue paper, I ranged in a row other supplies of honey on glass slips placed over papers of other colours—yellow, orange, red, green, black, and white.

We note that it was only after a bee had become *accustomed* to take the honey off *blue* paper that it was put to the test. Surely the fair test would have been to offer the bee honey on the different colours when it first came. But as a matter of fact we believe that Lord Avebury's experiments were not designed to show that *bees prefer blue*, but rather that they can distinguish and appreciate colour. To show that they prefer blue, a different series of experiments would be required.

But if the bee does prefer blue, and if Lord Avebury's experiments be held to prove it, they could be easily repeated by others. It is a significant fact that they have never been confirmed by any other observer; it may be even doubted whether Lord Avebury himself has repeated them a sufficient number of times to completely eliminate the element of chance. One observer, M. Bonnier, who tried some similar experiments, found that the colour of the paper beneath the honey made no difference in the frequency of the

bees' visits. But then, of course, he had not first accustomed the bees to come to the blue.

Let us suppose, however, for the sake of argument, that Lord Avebury's experiments have been conducted under sufficiently rigid scientific conditions, that they have been sufficiently often repeated, and that he is justified in the conclusions he has drawn from them. Even this is not enough. If this *preference* on the part of the bee is to make it efficient as an evolver of blue flowers, it must show it by picking out blue flowers for its visits. And if the action of the bee in nature seems to contradict Lord Avebury's conclusions, it is surely these latter that will have to be explained away. Let us, then, look at the real bee at work among the flowers. It occurs at once that a decisive experiment would be to present a bee with a number of flowers of a similar shape and scent, but differing in colour. And anyone who possesses a garden will find all the details for the experiment arranged for him there. He has only to go out, note-book in hand, and jot down the progress of the experiment. A bed of hyacinths, for example, often presents us with the three colours, red, white, and blue together. Watch the bees on such a bed. As they arrive, one goes first to a white flower, another to a blue, and a third to a red. They pass from white to blue or red, from red to blue or white, and from blue to white or red. They take the different colours, in fact, in every order possible on the mathematical theory of permutations. And let us note that Darwin himself observed and recorded the fact that bees pass indifferently from one colour to another in the same species.

> Humble and hive bees [he writes] are good botanists, for they know that varieties may differ widely, in the colour of their flowers, and yet belong to the same species. I have repeatedly seen humble bees flying straight from a plant of the ordinary red *Dictamnus Fraxinella* to a white variety; and from one to another very differently coloured variety of *Delphinium Consolida* and of *Primula veris*; from a dark purple to a bright yellow variety of *Viola tricolor*; and with species of *Papaver*, from one variety to another which differed much in colour.

Then, again, what are the colours of the flowers on which we see the bees at work in our gardens and in the fields? Consider the case of *green* flowers, those which, according to the theory, have remained in that state from which the bee has redeemed the more brightly coloured. These have presumably remained green because they have not been chosen by the bee. So, then, we should expect to find them neglected by the 'azure-loving' insect. But there are a number of green or greenish flowers much frequented by bees. In April bees innumerable may be seen gathering nectar from the uncompromisingly green flowers of the sycamore. So devoted are they to these flowers that it has attracted the attention of the poet. Coleridge writes of

> The sycamore oft musical with bees.

They will even haunt the sycamore while the azure bells of the wild hyacinth are hanging out their stores to tempt them. Bent on the study of the bees' floral tastes, the writer of this paper walked one sunny April day through a wood carpeted with the lovely blue of these flowers. On them *eight* bees were seen at work. At the edge of the wood a sycamore tree had hung out its green tassels of blossoms, and it was 'musical with bees.' Hundreds of them were busy on the tree from the lowest branches to the highest twigs. Beneath the tree wild hyacinths, which Mr. Grant Allen says 'have acquired a blue pigment to attract the eyes of azure-loving bees,' spread their inviting carpet. On them was *one* bee.

So also the green flowers of the red currant in our gardens, and the insignificant greenish-white flowers of the rasp are often resorted to by the bee. And in the early spring the greenish-yellow flowers of the willow are thronged with the busy insects. Virgil noted it long ago. In Dryden's translation he says :

> Behold, yon neighbouring fence of sallow trees
> Is fraught with flowers, the flowers are fraught with bees.

And Mr. Grant Allen, the sponsor of the 'azure-loving bee,' says, 'You hardly ever see a willow catkin in full bloom without a bevy of its attendant fertilising insects.'

And then there is the lime tree, 'a summer home of murmurous wings,' and yet its flowers differ little in colour from the leaves. The green flower of the Virginian creeper and the greenish-white of the holly are also frequented by bees, and in the autumn they may be seen seeking honey on the yellowish-green flowers of the ivy. Finally, we note a plant growing in South Brazil mentioned by Fritz Müller, who collected *Facts and Arguments for Darwin*, of which the flowers are visited very abundantly all day long by the hive bee and other species, 'although they are scentless, greenish, quite inconspicuous, and to a great extent hidden by the foliage.'

If the 'kisses of the bee' can transform a green flower into a blue, why have these blossoms remained in their green obscurity ?

Yellow flowers also appeal to the 'azure-loving bee' in a strange way. The yellow charlock of our cornfields furnishes them with much nectar, and in some places affords the staple of the bee-keeper's harvest. 'The broom's betrothed to the bee,' says Hood, and indeed this flower, along with the whin and laburnum, are much visited. Of the two species of whin Mr. Grant Allen remarks that 'between them they keep up an endless succession of blossoms for the bees.' Various species of sunflower and harpalium also appear to be favourites, while in spring they come in crowds to the yellow crocus. And when Ariel wished to compare himself to a bee he thought of a yellow flower :

> Where the bee sucks there suck I,
> In a cowslip's bell I lie.

And how often white flowers are bee haunted! Virgil, in his picture of the bees among the flowers of the meadow on the calm summer day, sees them specially crowding round the *white* lilies:

> In pratis, ubi apes aestate serena
> Floribus insidunt variis, et candida circum
> Lilia funduntur.

And do we not in our general recollections of the bee rather associate it with the white flowers of the orchard than with the blue flowers of the garden? So it was with the American poet Bryant:

> The wind of May
> Is sweet with breath of orchards, in whose boughs
> The bees and every insect of the air
> Make a perpetual murmur of delight.

He sees them, again, crowding to the white blossoms of the pear-tree:

> I ask in vain
> Who planted on the slope this lofty group
> Of ancient pear-trees, that with springtime burst
> Into such breadth of bloom. . . .
>
> I ask in vain,
> Yet bless the unknown hand to which I owe
> This annual festival of bees.

Jean Ingelow recalls them among the cherry blossoms:

> Wild cherry boughs above us spread
> The whitest shade was ever seen,
> And flicker, flicker, came and fled
> Sun spots between,
> Bees murmured in the milk-white bloom.

Keats sees them on the hawthorn:

> A bush of May flowers with the bees about them.

And many people must have noticed the bees' devotion to the snowy flowers of the arabis so largely grown in our spring borders. Moore notes their eagerness for white flowers when he writes:

> New legions soon
> Pour to the spot, like bees of Kauzeroon.

For the bees of Kauzeroon pour forth to cull the famous honey from the white flowers of the orange. And then the white clover!

> Crowds of bees are giddy with clover.

The white clover is one of the chief sources of the beekeeper's harvest. And even when the bat wheels silently by:

> Still the solitary humble bee
> Sings in the bean-flower—

a white blossom spotted with black. Of the balm, again, Gerarde remarked, 'They are delighted with this herb above others.' And in colour this flower is white or spotted with rose.

We need not pursue the colour question through the pinks, reds, purples, and other shades to which it is often difficult to give a name. It would, indeed, be difficult to name *any* colour which bees do not appreciate as much as blue. Not that the bee despises blue flowers. There are blue flowers much visited, but these are neither more numerous in species nor more frequently visited than green, yellow, or white. The bee, in fact, is indifferent to the colour of the flower it visits. It will even on occasions do without the flowers altogether. Thus Mr. Bates tells us of certain forest-bees in South America which 'are more frequently seen feeding on the sweet sap which exudes from the tree, or on the excrement of birds on leaves, than on flowers.'

Whatever, then, may be the right interpretation of Lord Avebury's experiments, they do not prove that the bee selects blue flowers in nature. And if it does not, it cannot have been the agent in their evolution.

But if the bee is to play the part of florist-in-chief to the human race, and evolve for man the blue flower, another qualification is required. It must not only prefer blue flowers, and visit them rather than those of other colours, it must also be *constant* in its visits. That is to say, it must visit only one species of flower in a single journey. Otherwise it will carry pollen from one species to another, and so retard rather than promote the evolution of a new species. And Darwin has emphasised the need for guarding against crossing as regards the new varieties of the florist. As a result of his long series of experiments on cross-fertilisation, he warns gardeners against allowing a cross even between flowers of the same variety. If, then, the bee is to play the part of florist in nature, it must exhibit a high degree of constancy in its visits. And it has been gifted, by a number of writers who do not seem to have been very familiar with its habits, with a degree of constancy which has been considered by many sufficient for the purpose.

Darwin quotes Aristotle:

> During each flight the bee does not settle upon flowers of different kinds, but flies, as it were, from violet to violet, and touches no other species till it returns to the hive.

But why should a great naturalist and keen observer drag out of its obscurity a somewhat vague *assertion* of an old Greek writer when he might have made direct observations for himself? And why should he bolster it up with an obviously unscientific statement from an obscure writer named Dobbs, to the following effect:

> I have frequently followed a bee loading the farina, bee-bread, or crude wax on its legs through part of a great field in flower, and on whatever flower it first

alighted and gathered the farina, it continued gathering from that kind of flower, and passed over many other species, though very numerous in the field, without alighting on or loading from them, though the flower it chose was much scarcer than the others; so that, if it began to load from a daisy, it continued loading from the same, neglecting clover, honeysuckle, and the violet?

As a matter of fact the *inconstancy* of the bee did not escape the keen observation of Darwin, as the following quotation shows:

In a flower-garden containing some plants of œnothera, the pollen of which can easily be recognised, I found not only single grains, but masses of it within many flowers of mimulus, digitalis, antirrhinum, and linaria. Other kinds of pollen were likewise detected in these same flowers. A large number of the stigmas of a plant of thyme, in which the anthers were completely aborted, were examined; and these stigmas, though scarcely larger than a split needle, were covered, not only with pollen of thyme brought from other plants by the bees, but with several other kinds of pollen.

And yet Darwin expresses his opinion on the bee's constancy thus:

All kinds of bees, and certain other insects, usually visit the flowers of the same species as long as they can before going to another species.

Other writers have expressed themselves in similar terms. Hermann Müller states that:

The most specialised, and especially the gregarious bees, have produced great differentiations in colour, which enables them on their journeys to keep to a single species of flower.

It is a remarkable fact [says Lord Avebury] that in most cases bees confine themselves in each journey to a single species.

And Dr. A. R. Wallace writes:

Now it has been ascertained by several observers that many insects, bees especially, keep to one kind of flower at a time, visiting hundreds of blossoms in succession and passing over other species that may be mixed with them.

As a matter of fact it has not been *ascertained* by anybody, and the above writers in thus expressing their opinions seem to show that they have not been very familiar with the habits of the real bee. Take, for example, the following notes of what the bee really does in visiting flowers.

Here is one gathering honey from the little white flowers of the chickweed, from which it goes to dandelion. It returns to chickweed, but presently leaves it for blue veronica. Back to chickweed it goes, and then to dandelion, returning to chickweed once more. Again we see it on veronica, and then it returns to chickweed, where we leave it.

In this corner of the garden, again, is a rockery on which different species of wild geranium are growing together. On the adjacent wall are hanging great tufts of the ivy-leaved toad-flax. We choose a particular bee out of the many which are resorting here for nectar,

and follow its movements as long as we can. There, that one has visited *forty-four* flowers, and changed the species of flower *ten* times.

Again, we catch sight of a bee leaving the flower of a balsam. It flies down, and alights on the purple blossoms of the meadow crane's-bill, from which it goes to wild marjoram. It could scarcely have chosen three more dissimilar and widely separated flowers for consecutive visits.

In this early spring day, again, we find bees busy on the flowers of the chickweed (white), veronica (blue), scilla (blue), and little celandine (yellow). One goes from veronica to chickweed; another from celandine to scilla and back to celandine; a third goes from veronica to chickweed and back to veronica; a fourth goes from celandine to scilla.

And these are not isolated cases:

> Examples I could cite you more,
> But be contented with these four;
> For when one's proofs are aptly chosen,
> Four are as valid as four dozen.

And anyone can obtain more for himself with a little care. A famous botanist, Kerner von Marilaun, writes on the subject thus:

> Insects certainly show a preference for a single species for considerable periods, particularly when this species is flowering in quantity on a confined space; still, anyone who closely observes insects visiting flowers can easily convince himself that the flowers visited are changed from time to time. A bee which has just dusted itself with pollen in the flower of a winter aconite will fly across to a bush of *Salix daphnoides*, and as it passes a plant of *Daphne Mezereum* it will suck its honey; a moment later it will swoop down to the flowers of crocus in the meadow near by, and then fly on to the sweet violet. On the stigma of the last-mentioned plant will be found the pollen of all or several of the just visited flowers; on the crocus that of the willow, and so on.

But even if such cases are explained away as solitary instances—which they are not—the bee would still be an utterly incompetent florist. For all species were *ex hypothesi* once *mere varieties*, and to raise these to the rank of species the bee must be constant to varieties: it must visit only one *variety* on a single journey. This is of even more importance than constancy as regards species. But not even the most extreme supporters of the theory have suggested that the bee does so. It is admitted, in fact, that bees pass freely from one variety to another of the same species.

Darwin recorded his observation of this fact when, as we have seen, he called bees 'good botanists.' And anyone can see it taking place daily in any garden where differently coloured varieties are growing together.

Bees are also supposed to have selected the shape of flower best suited to them, and so to have evolved the spurs, hoods, tubes, and lips which occur in so many blossoms. No Lord Avebury has come

forward to show that a bee prefers to take its honey out of a spur, or a hood, rather than from a flower of another shape. It is only supposed to do so because the theory requires it. And the flowers, according to the theory, have responded marvellously to the bees' exertions, and given them every convenience of shape. And yet the unconscionable bee is not satisfied. The flower offers it every facility for alighting and getting the nectar easily and quickly. Yet there are some 300 species of flowers in the European flora in which humble bees will bite through the calyx or corolla to get the honey.

And then, if we take any particular species of bee, we find that it visits a number of flowers of widely different shapes. Even on a single journey a bee may visit such widely varying types of flower as the balsam, wild geranium, and marjoram.

In their visits to flowers, indeed, bees offer some curious, one might almost say derisive, comments on the 'beautiful theory' in which they are supposed to have played so important a part. 'When there is any variation in the size of the flowers, the smaller and less showy ones would be the last to be visited by the insects,' says Müller. And this is what the bee must have done if it has evolved the blue flower. We are not sure, indeed, that it should not have gone further, and refused altogether to visit the 'smaller and less showy ones.' But we note in passing that Müller does not say *are* the last to be visited, but only *would be*. He does not give it, that is to say, as the result of his own observation—as indeed he could not—but it is what ought to happen if the theory is true. Lord Avebury says insects fertilise 'the largest and most brilliant flowers,' an assertion equally devoid of foundation. Here are some of the bees' comments. Some of the flowers of a wild geranium have lost their petals, leaving only the green calyx to attract the bee. While we watch, several bees visit such petal-less flowers. The same thing happens on a patch of cistus, and also on a flowering bramble bush. And Darwin himself has noted the visits of bees to flowers which have lost their petals. Here, again, is a flower of white clematis of which snails have eaten the greater part of the petals. Yet it receives as many bee visits as the perfect flowers on the same plant.

There, again, is a flower in that bed of harpaliums of which a caterpillar has neatly eaten off the ray florets. Nevertheless, there is a bee on it gathering nectar, although there are scores of perfect flowers around it! Such are the strange ways of the bee, which in the imagination of certain theorists selects the most showy flowers for its visits!

With Aristotle's bee, constant in its visits, and Lord Avebury's bee, preferring blue, you may, theoretically, produce a blue flower. You put your penny of faith in the slot, and it is evolved while you wait. With the bee of nature, the real visitor of the flowers, this is impossible.

If it be true that:

> 'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view
> And robes the mountain in its *azure* hue,

it would also appear that it is remoteness from actual fact which has enabled the theorists to crown the bee with an azure halo and make it the evolver of the blue flower.

G. W. BULMAN.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

In the August issue of this Review there appeared a brief account of the systematic steps taken throughout the past century to provide agricultural education in the United States. The movement here is of much later origin. It was not until 1888 that the Government, upon the recommendation of Sir Richard Paget's Departmental Committee, first adopted the policy of giving direct aid to agricultural and dairy schools by specific annual grants. Progress since that date has been considerable, and, on the whole, satisfactory. The grants have steadily but slowly risen from 2,610*l.* in 1889, to 10,625*l.*, including the special grants for experiment and research, for the year 1904–1905.[1] Such a sum is, of course, insignificant when compared with the vast State expenditure upon agricultural education in the United States, Canada, France, Würtemberg, and Denmark. In Ireland, too, according to the last report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, the net amount of the expenditure on the agricultural side of the Department's work in 1904–1905, including 7,500*l.* allocated for manual instruction and instruction in domestic economy in rural districts, was 166,895*l.* The grants by the English Board of Agriculture, however, do not include the cost incurred in the necessary inspection of the institutions aided; nor do they take any account of what is expended by local authorities out of the residue grant under the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, commonly called the 'whisky' money. From this source a sum of 87,472*l.* was devoted to various forms of agricultural education for the year 1904–1905. This represents a total outlay by central and local authorities of nearly 100,000*l.* per annum, to which ought to be added the grants paid by the Board of Education to continuation schools in so far as they embrace agricultural subjects. Agriculturists would have little reason to complain of the insufficiency of these subsidies, provided they could be assured that the local aid would continue to be upon the same scale as here-

[1] Since the publication of the last statistics the following additional grants have been made:—Ridgmont Agricultural Institute, 100*l.*; Hants Farm School at Basing, 100*l.*; Midland Agricultural and Dairy Institute, 800*l.* instead of 750*l.*

tofore, and provided that the central funds were more equitably distributed. In regard to the first point there is a good deal of uncertainty. Under the Education Act of 1902 the residue grant is applicable to all branches of higher education, and education committees are called upon to provide out of it, together with their own education rate, for the maintenance of secondary schools of all types, new secondary schools, university and higher technical training, technical (including agricultural and technological) instruction, continuation schools, scholarships and exhibitions, and the training of teachers. It is obvious that the funds at the disposal of county councils, even when a maximum rate is levied, which it will be extremely difficult to levy in rural districts, are wholly inadequate to the proper satisfaction of these wide obligations, and the interests of agriculture may suffer. It has thus become increasingly important for agriculturists generally to urge their claims, if they are not to be stifled by other pressing demands. Already the local aid to agriculture shows some tendency to diminish. Although the residue grant for 1904–1905 was 816*l.* in excess of that for the previous year, the amount appropriated out of it to agricultural education was less by 3,793*l.* At the same time the changes effected by the Act of 1902 afford good ground for appealing to the Government that the Board of Agriculture may be entrusted with much larger funds for educational purposes.

The glaring defect in the present situation is the absence of anything in the nature of a national system. There is no central authority responsible for the agricultural education of the whole country. Provision for the needs of each county depends upon the policy of each particular council. Englishmen justly pride themselves on their jealousy of State interference and their preference for local or private initiative, but there is a point at which this disinclination to accept State guidance or direction becomes a positive evil. The inevitable result is that, while some counties have elaborated excellent schemes with carefully graduated courses of instruction from the elementary school to the most advanced college, in others large districts, especially those in which the art of farming has sunk to the lowest ebb, are entirely neglected. This was very clearly demonstrated by a map which Lord Onslow, when President of the Board of Agriculture, had prepared for a conference on agricultural education at Gloucester in October 1904. It was shown that none of the counties, proceeding from Warwickshire in a south-westerly direction, had any facilities for intermediate or higher education except the private and non-local colleges of Cirencester and Downton. Under the Seale-Hayne bequest Devon will eventually have a collegiate centre near Newton Abbot, to which Cornwall may be affiliated; otherwise the omissions indicated by the map remain as they were two years ago. It is hoped that the University of Oxford may ultimately occupy the same

position in relation to the western counties as the University of Cambridge does to the eastern, and grant an agricultural diploma or degree. Spasmodic and ineffectual lectures may occasionally be given, but often the only person who derives any benefit from them is the man paid for delivering them. It would not be easy to exaggerate the harm done in the past by sending, as pioneers, men with no knowledge of agriculture beyond that of a text-book, and speaking a language unintelligible to labourers. It will probably take a generation to eradicate the bad impression thus created, and to win the confidence of village people. Warned by our injudicious employment of itinerant instructors, the Irish Department have resolutely set their face against sanctioning attempts at this branch of agricultural education, until the trained and qualified teacher is available. In their opinion, 'not only is serious mischief done by bad teaching to those who are subjected to it, but in the districts where it is practised it ends by discrediting and setting back the cause of agricultural education for many years.'

With the object of introducing some uniformity of action, and placing unrelated effort upon a more systematic basis, the Agricultural Education Committee in October 1901 passed the following resolutions:

(1) That if the Board of Agriculture retain their present educational work, it is essential that there shall be complete co-operation between that Board and the Board of Education in all educational matters affecting the agricultural classes.

(2) That for purposes of agricultural education the country should be divided into districts, and such inspectors be appointed as may be necessary.

(3) That groups of counties, not yet affiliated to any collegiate centre, should be formed, each group being affiliated to some centre.

(4) That, after due inquiry, reports should be issued dealing with the most appropriate forms of agricultural education for each county.

(5) That permanent demonstration stations should be organised in each county or group of counties.

(6) That official information bearing upon all matters of agricultural interest, whether educational or otherwise, should be distributed to the public free of cost.

(7) That to carry out the above objects it is essential that larger funds be placed at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture for educational purposes.

(8) That the work of the Board of Agriculture might be facilitated by the appointment of a Consultative Committee on the analogy of those of the Board of Education, and of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland.

It is to be regretted that the Committee, whose previous recommendations upon the curricula for village schools and upon the

training of teachers were adopted by the Board of Education, and which has never been formally dissolved, should have discontinued its valuable work. Such a Committee furnished the most effective means for forming and consolidating public opinion, and from its representative and influential character could bring a pressure to bear upon the Government which no other organisation, however strong it may be on the professional side, can exercise. The policy advocated by the Committee met with the general approval of the late Mr. Hanbury, and there is no reason for supposing that his successors at the Board of Agriculture are not in agreement with it. Effect has been partially given to some of the suggestions, but much remains to be done. The Boards of Agriculture and Education have loyally co-operated to promote agricultural welfare, and there is no evidence of any friction between them, but it is still urged by many that the educational functions of the latter should be transferred to the former, as provided by the Board of Education Act, 1899. The arguments in favour of having a single central authority responsible for all education are undeniable. It is, however, doubtful whether the transfer would operate to the benefit of agriculture. From a variety of causes the Board of Education is not popular with farmers, who regard all that emanates from it with considerable suspicion. This feeling is certainly disappearing through the tact and practical methods of Mr. Dymond, since his appointment as Inspector of Rural Education, but the ground to be covered is too vast for any single individual, and his duties must occasionally overlap those which more strictly fall within the sphere of the Board of Agriculture. With the educational work of that Board, so far as its small funds admit, little fault can be found; it merely requires expansion. Elsewhere no difficulty has arisen from having a dual authority. In France, for instance, the Ministries of Agriculture and Public Instruction have joint charge of agricultural education. Such agricultural or horticultural instruction as is given in primary o higher primary schools and in the normal (training) schools is in the hands of the latter; all beyond it in those of the former. This arrangement is carried out with perfect smoothness.

Some increase in the inspectorate has been made, but additional inspectors, who should be assigned to particular areas, are wanted. It is only in this way that the Board can be kept in complete touch with local activity.

The tendency of counties to group themselves in affiliation to some collegiate centre has developed. Every county in Wales, with the exception of Glamorganshire, is affiliated either to Bangor or Aberystwyth. In England the grouping is as follows: Wye (Kent and Surrey), Reading (Berks, Oxford, Hants, Dorset, and Bucks), Midland Dairy Institute (Notts, Leicester, Derby, and the Lindsey division of Lincoln), Leeds (the three Ridings of Yorks), Cambridge

(Bedford, Cambridge, Essex, Hertford, Huntingdon, Isle of Ely, Norfolk, Northampton, East and West Suffolk), Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland, and Westmorland), Harper Adams College (Shropshire and Staffordshire). The relationship between the affiliated counties and the centres varies considerably. In some cases there appears to be little, if any, organic connection; nor does the affiliated county always make any appreciable contribution towards the cost of maintaining the centre. Cambridge, for instance, where ampler funds are sorely needed, only obtained 785*l.* last year from the ten counties associated with it. Reading had nothing. Wye, on the other hand, received 2,772*l.* from Surrey.

Although the advice of the Board has been sought to an increasing extent, it does not appear that the Board has *suo motu* reported upon, or suggested schemes of instruction appropriate to, the varying circumstances of different counties. Were this seriously undertaken, it could hardly fail to be of great service. There would be no obligation upon any local authority to adopt the suggested scheme, but it would at least afford a definite proposal for discussion. In Ireland the Department early in summer prepares in outline a number of schemes likely to be of advantage to the whole country. These schemes are then submitted to the Agricultural Board, and, if this *body approve of them and concur in the application thereto of the necessary funds, the schemes are forthwith sent to each of the thirty-three county committees.* The committees meet in autumn, and, with the assistance of an inspector of the Department, select the schemes most appropriate to their county, and arrange details to suit local needs. The schemes, with an estimate of their cost, are afterwards returned to the Department, whose approval is accompanied by a statement of the proportion of the cost which they are prepared to defray.

A memorandum on a Council of Agricultural Research was recently prepared by the Board. The principal function of this council would be to promote *original* investigation, and to systematise and coordinate the experimental work now undertaken by various institutions. Hitherto the State has done little in this direction, and substantial aid from the Treasury is essential if the operations of the proposed council are to be made really effective.

The Board has not yet seen its way to appoint a consultative committee. The functions of such a committee can hardly be performed by the correspondents nominated in the different counties. The Irish Department is strengthened by its Consultative Committee of five members, its Agricultural Board of twelve members, and its Council of one hundred and four members. The official mind is thus kept in constant touch with the best lay opinion. Similarly in France and Holland the advisory councils form an integral part of their systems of agricultural education. Isolated correspondents, whatever

their qualifications, can never occupy the same position, and they have not the advantage of meeting the elected representatives of other districts in frequent consultation.

As regards the existing provision for agricultural education, in the higher branches it may be considered fairly complete. The mere multiplication of colleges of the first grade would serve no useful purpose. The number of students who can afford to spend the time and money involved in a course of two or three years' duration will always be limited, and it is better to maintain the colleges now in operation in as high a state of efficiency as possible than to run the risk of lowering their standard by excessive competition with other institutions. One point, however, deserves consideration. Allusion was made above to a more equitable distribution of their funds by the Board of Agriculture. Eight institutions absorb 8,750*l.* of the 10,625*l.* expended by the Board. It may be questioned whether the Board could not utilise the funds more profitably by stimulating other grades of agricultural education. In the words of the principal of one of the leading agricultural colleges :

> There is already an actual danger of a wider scope being given to the State-aided agricultural education than is consistent with the proper training of the *future farmer*, and with the expenditure of *public money*. The recruits for the future army of farmers must be trained for their own special industry and profession, and not for the industries and professions in other walks of life, otherwise the land and its cultivation must inevitably suffer. There is no sound or just reason whatever why the curriculum for the training contemplated should include education for the professions of land-agents, surveyors, and other correlated professions. If it be so framed and worked upon, then the once intending young farmer, at the end of his course, will have his head full of dreams of lectureship, land agencies, and such like instead of the tasks and labours of the farm. In framing then the curriculum of State-aided and rate-aided colleges for farmers, the object must not be the status and *kudos* of a staff, or the attraction of the wealthier classes, but the real needs of the class to which we have to look for our future farmers. And I most strongly deprecate, as an abuse of public money, certain to alienate public sympathy from the movement we desire, any outlay of public funds, whether of rates or taxes, taken from the already overburdened ratepayer and taxpayer, to provide for such professions, or to assist the education of the sons of the wealthier class of farmers, of the landed gentry, or of well-to-do commercial and professional men.

This warning is justified by the very scanty provision of facilities for intermediate agricultural education of a systematic character. Notoriously one of the most difficult problems is to provide for the sons of small farmers from thirteen or fourteen to sixteen or seventeen years of age, and the difficulty is in some danger of being shelved. Schools originally established to meet this particular need are inclined to model their curricula upon those of the advanced colleges with a view to the requirements of the National Diploma in Agriculture. That diploma may or may not be the best *terminus ad quem* for the

advanced colleges. Opinions differ, and it is unnecessary to discuss the question here. It can hardly be doubted, however, that a programme of studies based on those requirements is unsuitable for a lad who is to commence practical farming at the age of sixteen or seventeen, and it is extremely unlikely that the previous education of the lads in the elementary school will have qualified them to profit by the instruction offered. Educationists and agriculturists are quite aware of this, but there is a serious risk of the gradual abandonment of any attempt to provide organised intermediate education. It is a striking fact that when arrangements for the Gloucester Conference, previously mentioned, were being made, it was found impossible to discover anyone in England who could speak with actual knowledge of the proper type of school and syllabus of instruction. Neither the Board of Agriculture nor the foremost agricultural authorities could suggest a fitting person. Professor Robert Wallace, of Edinburgh, read an excellent paper upon the functions and limitations of the intermediate school, but for definite details as to organisation and curricula it was necessary to apply to M. Grosjean, Inspector-General of Agriculture in France. He sent an exhaustive account of the *écoles pratiques d'agriculture*. Fifty of these schools are now in operation, and they clearly indicate the lines to be followed. Attention should be specially directed to this branch of agricultural education, and the Board of Agriculture might well for a time concentrate its educational activities upon it. The intermediate school is not easy to conduct. Its principal needs qualifications which are not so essential in the case of an advanced college. He must be in complete sympathy with the tenant-farmer, thoroughly understand his difficulties and point of view, and know, if possible from personal experience, how to manage a small farm. Otherwise his influence with the parents of those for whom the school is primarily intended will prove slight.

In this connection it would be unfair to omit all mention of the Dauntsey Agricultural School at West Lavington, which affords an interesting instance of the way in which an old educational endowment may be utilised for agricultural education. Its equipment both within and outside the school leaves nothing to be desired, and the agricultural programme is eminently suitable for the sons of small farmers The school, however, in the opinion of the writer, suffers somewhat from combining general education with specific agricultural instruction. There is a lurking suspicion, which may, of course, be quite unfounded, that the agricultural scholarships are occasionally held by boys whose parents are glad enough for them thus to obtain indirectly free tuition, &c., in general subjects, but have no idea of their ever following an agricultural calling. One cannot help feeling that, if the school were converted into one for intermediate agricultural education solely, it would appeal more strongly to farmers

and be of greater practical service as a recruiting ground for future farmers, but there may be insuperable obstacles to this.

In view of the comparative failure of the existing institutions to attract the son of the small farmer, local authorities cannot be blamed for shrinking from the great expense involved in the establishment and equipment of an intermediate school, even if they possessed the necessary funds. In time the demand for such schools may come from the farmers themselves, as the reforms now being introduced into village schools remove their prejudices against schools in general, and they realise more and more that success in farming depends no less upon scientific knowledge than upon manual skill. Meanwhile, what are the best facilities to offer? Agricultural sides to ordinary secondary schools rarely prosper. Farmers still fight shy of them. They refuse to believe that anything of agricultural value can be acquired under such conditions. The term 'agricultural' is in itself misleading; it implies more than the schools are capable of giving. The subjects taught are, however, of the first importance to every agriculturist, and might for the most part be fitly comprised in a scheme of general education. Misapprehension of the aim might be avoided, and the indifference or mistrust of farmers be overcome, if the word 'agricultural' were dropped and the specialised instruction were entitled 'rural science,' or simply 'nature study' in its wider applications.

The higher elementary school perhaps offers the best solution of the difficulty. In his valuable report on secondary and higher education in Derbyshire Mr. Sadler recommends the organisation of schools of this type at eight or possibly nine centres. He is concerned rather with the commercial and industrial aspects of the question than with the agricultural, but he clearly demonstrates the necessity for this grade of education for those who can attend school until the age of fifteen or sixteen, but for whom a secondary school is unsuitable. For the adaptation of the curricula to rural and agricultural needs Mr. Morant's paper on the French *écoles primaires supérieures* in Volume I. of *Special Reports on Educational Subjects* remains the most reliable guide. Portions of that paper might at the present moment be circulated with great advantage by the Board of Education to the members of all education committees. It contains just the information and advice that are wanted when advocating, or before embarking upon, any new departure. Slavish imitation of foreign methods is not suggested, but as yet we must go to France for a model. No visitor to the school at Onzain (Loir-et-Cher), for instance, can fail to appreciate the excellence and practical character of the instruction there. Many of our small rural grammar schools, which languish for lack of pupils and supply nothing that the working farmer desires for his children, might be converted into higher elementary schools with distinctive industrial or agricultural teaching for

pupils in their third year. The interests of that section of the rural population which will not engage in any agricultural pursuit must not, of course, be overlooked. Where no schools capable of conversion exist, any large outlay upon bricks and mortar from public funds is under present circumstances very improbable, and we must rely upon private benefactors like the Duchess of Sutherland and the Countess of Warwick, whose schools at Goldspie and Bigods closely resemble the *écoles primaires supérieures*. In their report to the Board of Education on higher elementary schools the Consultative Committee recommend the system of supplementary courses for the rural districts. These courses, which are briefly outlined in the Scotch Code, and more fully described in the *Selection of Circular Letters of the Scotch Education Department*, 1898–1904 (pp. 37–46), have been developed with marked success in Scotland. It is, however, essential, as the committee hint, that the grants here should be upon the same liberal scale as the Scotch grants, a suggestion which equally applies to the grants for higher elementary schools.

The establishment of winter schools of agriculture and horticulture, similar to those in Holland, of which some account was given in this Review for March 1903, would be the most economical and efficacious way of providing for those who cannot be absent from the farm except during the winter months. Schools of this type have been organised by the Irish Department at Downpatrick and Monaghan with very gratifying results. The course in each case lasts for twenty weeks, and the pupils in attendance number twenty and twenty-one respectively. The advantages of this system have been thus summarised: (*a*) The initial outlay is small; (*b*) the equipment being simple, the scheme, if not satisfactory, can be abandoned without financial loss; (*c*) the site can be readily changed should experience show that a change is necessary; (*d*) a temporary school of this nature forms an excellent nucleus for a permanent and better equipped centre; and (*e*) the experience gained affords invaluable guidance for future development. Short winter courses at collegiate centres are usually too advanced for lads engaged in farm work. The instruction should be such as is offered at the Cumberland and Westmorland Farm School, Newton Rigg, in its winter course of sixteen weeks.

For the great majority of country lads the continuation school furnishes the only opportunity for further education of any kind, and to it we must look mainly for the gradual improvement of the rural districts. What Cambridgeshire has accomplished in this direction should not be beyond the power of other counties. Everyone knows that it is comparatively easy to start a class, but not so easy to retain the pupils. In their recent memorandum on courses of work in rural evening schools the Board of Education make many valuable suggestions. The instruction must be attractive, practically useful,

and calculated to increase wage-earning capacity. The aim should be to cause the lad who does not attend a continuation school to feel that he is placed at a disadvantage as compared with the one who does. In one or two localities employers, whose work is sought after, have insisted that their lads shall attend a continuation school, and it is remarkable what an effect this has had in stimulating the voluntary attendance of others. No better argument could be adduced for the proposal to empower local authorities to frame by-laws, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, to enforce attendance at a continuation school up to a particular age and under certain circumstances. Everyone familiar with village life realises how much might be done for young boys and girls if they could be kept from idle loafing on the long winter evenings, and that no local authority can as yet compel attendance is an anomaly. Lessons from books alone and lectures may be dismissed as virtually worthless. Lads must be taught to use their hands and eyes as much as possible. They should be doing or making something to begin with—baskets, metal or wood work. Lessons on gardening may be given in winter, to be followed by the cultivation of gardens in spring and summer. Instruction may then follow upon fruit culture generally, market gardening and marketing, the care of stock, farriery, the construction and repair of agricultural machinery, poultry-keeping, bee-keeping, and, above all, in the principles and practice of co-operative production and distribution. In regard to the last subject, Sir Horace Plunkett, addressing the Council of Agriculture on the 16th of May, remarked :

> I now beg to submit the somewhat strong, but, in my judgment, unanswerable proposition that, no matter what improvements you effect in the technical methods of the Irish farmers, unless you can at the same time bring about a revolution in his business methods, you will not counteract the tendency known as the rural exodus in most countries, which takes the form with us of emigration, and, worse still, of deterioration, owing to the quality of the human element that leaves our shores. The change proposed in the business methods of the Irish farmer is simply this. By whatever means this is to be attained, he must be taught to combine with his neighbours whenever and wherever some branch of the industry by which he lives can be more profitably conducted in combination than through isolated action.

What is true of Ireland is no less true of England.

The village school does not strictly fall within the scope of this article. Agriculture and the art of farming cannot be taught there. It cannot be too emphatically insisted upon that the country boy, whether destined to till the fields or not, needs just as thorough an elementary education as the town boy, and is entitled to receive what may enable him to rise to any position in life. Dissatisfaction with a purely bookish curriculum must not make us rush into the opposite extreme. Hitherto the great defect in the instruction has been its unreality ; it has been a thing apart from the daily lives of

the children, and has equipped them solely for urban occupations. It has been concentrated upon the development of the mental to the exclusion of every other faculty. Stores of information may be accumulated, but little is done to cultivate the powers of accurate observation and correct inference, upon which efficiency in every department of life depends. Intelligence, adaptability, and resourcefulness are quite as necessary for the labourer as for the artisan, and even more so, since the latter relies largely on mechanical contrivances, whereas the former has to control or subdue the forces of nature. The farmer who employs a lad wants exactly the same qualities in him as does any employer of labour. Intelligence, combined with dexterity of hand and eye, is the chief desideratum. The ultimate end of both urban and rural schools is identical—to promote mental alertness, an orderly habit of thinking, and a uniform development of all the faculties. To differentiate the one school from the other involves no fundamental change in their respective curricula. The subjects appropriate to the one are equally appropriate to the other; the difference lies in their treatment and in their orientation towards the immediate and varying surroundings of each school. We need more concrete and less abstract instruction, and a wider appreciation of the maxim 'Learn by doing.' We should teach less from books and more from things. We must bring the child into direct contact with the facts of the living world, leading him to investigate them for himself, telling him as little as possible, and thus stimulating that process of self-instruction which is the foundation of all true education.

In conclusion, there are certain questions by the answers to which the attitude of the statesman, the economist, and the farmer towards agricultural education will be finally determined. Has the money hitherto been expended to the best advantage? Are the results commensurate with the cost? Have the various colleges, schools, and classes succeeded in attracting pupils identified with the land and likely to be engaged in agricultural pursuits? Have the prejudice of the farmer and his love of routine been overcome? Does the agriculture of the country show appreciable improvement after the efforts of the past seventeen years? What types of schools and methods of instruction have proved most beneficial? What gaps are there to be filled? The answers to these questions can only be ascertained after such an inquiry and survey of the whole field as that to which Lord Carrington referred last session in the House of Lords.

JOHN C. MEDD.

DIVORCE IN THE UNITED STATES

THE men who made the Constitution of the United States had little realisation of the great benefit which they conferred on the country by leaving so many matters to the decision of the inhabitants of each of the separate States, which were formed of what had been separate colonies under English rule.

The members of the convention were forced to create the Government they did, because of the jealousies existing between the different States, and the desire of the inhabitants of each State to have all matters relating to local interests left to the decision of the local Legislatures. Judicial construction of the Constitution has created a powerful Government out of a document which at the time was generally considered to create merely a confederation, but it is still true that legislation which concerns the interests of the individuals is largely in the hands of the Legislature of each State, and each State decides on its policy, irrespective of the views of the inhabitants of other States.

To illustrate the situation one might examine the laws respecting the sale of alcoholic beverages. In Maine and Kansas the sale of all alcoholic beverages is prohibited by statute. In South Carolina the sale of liquor is a State monopoly. In New York and some other States there is a high-licence law, which limits the number of drinking-places, while in other States the licence fee is quite nominal. Besides all this, however, all dealers in liquor must take out a licence from the National Government, and the Congress levies a heavy duty on the production of alcoholic beverages.

Considering the vast expanse of the United States, consisting of over three million square miles, and extending west across the continent along the Canadian border for over 3,000 miles and south along the Atlantic coast-line for over 1,600 miles, it is very fortunate that in most matters of local interest each State has been left to work out its own salvation. These interests are varied largely also by great differences of climate, for on the Pacific coast is found an equable climate similar to that of France, while east of the Rocky Mountains one finds in the north greater contrasts of heat and cold than can be found in Russia, in the central region summers like those of Italy

and winters like those of Berlin, and in Florida and Southern California a tropical climate in which palm-trees, pineapples, and grapefruit flourish.

It is interesting in this connection to examine the different views which have been taken of divorce in the various States. It is not proposed to enter into any discussion of the laws of each State as to separation of married couples. Divorce from the bond of matrimony differs from all forms of separation in a very vital matter, for the purpose of an action of divorce as distinguished from separation is to enable one or both of the parties to re-marry. Nor is any examination made of the provision of the statutes for annulling marriage on account of incapacity or condition existing at the time of the performance of the marriage. The condition of the law is substantially as follows :

In South Carolina the courts do not grant decrees of divorce, and a marriage ceremony in that State is of no force when either party has been divorced, although the divorce was legal in the State where granted.

In New York divorce is granted only for adultery. It was found that there were many cases of collusive divorce, and a short time ago a law was enacted in accordance with the English system, providing that the final decree should not be entered for several months after the decision in favour of divorce was made. No decrees are granted in New York unless satisfactory evidence of infidelity is supplied. The result is that in that State, if either party is faithful to his or her marriage vows and does not wish to be divorced, there is no method by which the other party can procure a divorce valid in the State of New York. The guilty party is forbidden to marry again, but this does not prevent the guilty party from re-marrying in another State. In North Carolina the law is the same as in New York.

In Maryland and New Jersey divorces are granted for adultery as in New York, and also where abandonment for three or two years is shown. This is the rule in Virginia, except that conviction of a crime is also a ground there for divorce.

In New York and some Southern Atlantic Coast States the Episcopal Church, which is the offspring of the Church of England, has always had great influence, and in Maryland the Catholic Church has been powerful.

Abandonment for two or three years has been held in all the other States to be a ground for divorce in addition to the cause universally considered sufficient, and in nearly all of them the courts grant divorces for habitual drunkenness, for conviction of felony and for cruelty, so that it may be said that outside of New York, North and South Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, and Virginia, State Legislatures are unanimously in favour of divorce for these five causes. Besides these causes there are additional grounds for divorce as follows :

Insanity is a cause in Florida and Idaho.

Neglect to provide for the wife is a sufficient cause in California, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North and South Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In Florida, habitual indulgence in a violent temper is a good ground for divorce. In Kansas and Ohio, grave neglect of duty affords a sufficient ground.

In the district of Columbia, the laws of which are made by Congress, the New York rule prevails.

New Yorkers who both wish to escape from an unhappy marriage adopt two courses. Occasionally the husband allows the wife to obtain evidence which permits her to obtain a divorce on the statutory ground with the risk of having the Court find evidence of collusion, but the usual course where both consent to the divorce is for one of the parties to take up a residence in another State, where more liberal views of divorce are popular. The States usually chosen at present are South Dakota and Rhode Island. The wife applying for a divorce spends the better part of a year in the new jurisdiction, and usually procures a divorce on the ground that her husband has neglected to provide for her. Sometimes she is the richer of the two.

The divorces thus obtained are valid in New York if the court of the sister State obtains jurisdiction over the husband, but service of process by publication does not give jurisdiction. The husband must be personally served with process in the sister State granting the decree, or he must appear by attorney.

Statistics as to the number of divorced people in the various parts of the country have not been collected in a very satisfactory way, but the following are the figures furnished by the last census made by the Government in 1900:

Population	76,303,387
Single	44,187,155
Married	27,849,761
Widowed	3,903,857
Divorced	199,868

The *World Almanac*, published by a New York daily paper, claims to give the number of decrees of divorce granted in certain cities. These figures are as follows:

—	New York	Philadelphia	Boston	Chicago	Detroit	Indianapolis	Omaha
1900	522	484	245	1690	394	314	241
1901	596	494	445	1740	354	470	368
1902	670	577	421	1998	462	387	358
1903	803	640	508	2454	484	314	314
1904	848	614	512	2350	449	260	372

The New York figures include only New York County.

In order to compare the effect of liberal laws of divorce, these figures should be considered in respect to the population. The population of these cities can, however, only be computed as at the time of the census of 1900. Taking that year, we find that that part of New York City in which 522 decrees of divorce were entered contained 2,050,600 people. It can therefore be said that $\frac{1}{40}$th of 1 per cent. of the inhabitants were divorced in 1900. The same method shows the following results for the other cities :

Philadelphia	$\frac{1}{30}$th	of 1	per cent.
Boston	$\frac{1}{20}$th	,,	,,
Chicago	$\frac{1}{10}$th	,,	,,
Detroit	$\frac{1}{7}$th	,,	,,
Indianapolis	$\frac{1}{6}$th	,,	,,
Omaha	$\frac{1}{5}$th	,,	,,

This examination would lead to the conclusion that divorce is more popular in the West than in the East.

While there is a decided advantage in allowing people of each State to decide on all matters relating to domestic relations, and to ensure a husband or wife married within its jurisdiction the continuance of the matrimonial relation, the operation of the law has resulted in many complications.

It has been proposed that the Constitution of the United States should be amended so as to give Congress jurisdiction over marriage and divorce. If this is done, it is likely that the rule of the majorities of the States will be adopted, and that there will be no State in which the strict rules of New York, New Jersey, and Maryland will continue in force.

The complications referred to depend chiefly on questions of jurisdiction. Where one party to a marriage moves into another State and procures a divorce there after service of process on the defendant, by publication or in some other jurisdiction than that in which the action is begun, a much-discussed question of law arises.

If the defendant appears in the action by attorney, thus putting himself or herself within the jurisdiction of the court, the decrees are accepted in every State as settling the status of the parties; but in New York and some of the other States it has always been held that the court granting the divorce does not obtain jurisdiction over the party who is not personally served or represented by attorney before the trial court.[1] This is by analogy with the rule which holds that where the court never obtained actual jurisdiction over the defendant by service of process personally within the jurisdiction,

[1] This is in accord with the English law (Shaw *v.* Gould, *L. R.* 3 H. L. 55; Harvey *v.* Farnie, *L. R.* 8 App. Cas. 43).

judgments for personal debts have no force outside of the jurisdiction of the court granting the judgment.

In other States, however, it is held that decrees of divorce, obtained in the sister State after service of process by publication, are effective because a provision of the Constitution of the United States [2] requiring that full force and effect be given to the judgments and decrees of sister States is held to apply to judgments concerning the domestic relations which fix the status of the parties.

The Supreme Court of the United States recently affirmed in Haddock *v.* Haddock a decision of the New York Court of Appeals founded on the principles which have always prevailed there. In this case it was held that the wife, who continued to live in New York, was entitled in 1899 to a separation from her husband with an award of alimony when the husband had gone to another State, procured a divorce there in 1881, and married another woman. The court points out that by any different rule the marriage ties would be less protected than any other civil obligation, and that individual rights would be destroyed without a hearing and by tribunals having no jurisdiction over the defendant.

Apart from the Constitution, the determination of the law is left to the State court, and the Supreme Court holds that it will not interfere with the decision of the State court, because of the provision of the Constitution requiring that full force and effect be given to judgments of other States when, in fact, the court of the other State had no actual jurisdiction over the defendant; but the court expressly refuses to question the authority of the courts of States other than New York to give full force and effect under this provision of the Constitution to decrees of divorce obtained in other States, as many State courts have done, on the ground that a decision on a matter of domestic relations is as binding as a judgment *in rem*.[3]

In this particular case it appeared that the plaintiff had for some time been a *bona fide* resident of the State in which the action of divorce was brought. Four of the nine judges dissented from the decision, but expressly held that the decree of divorce would have no extra-territorial effect where the plaintiff had moved into the jurisdiction in order to obtain the divorce.[4]

Questions of inheritance and of the legitimacy of children and of

[2] 'Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State.'

[3] The court says that the rule does not debar other States from giving such effect to a judgment of that character as they may elect to do under mere principles of State comity.

[4] The rule laid down by one of the dissenting judges was, 'That the courts of one State may not grant a divorce against an absent defendant to any person who has not acquired a *bona fide* domicil in that State. The same rule applies if he has removed thither solely for the purpose of acquiring a domicil and obtaining a divorce for a cause which would have been insufficient in the State from which he removed.' Such a rule would leave the law very uncertain.

rights over children are involved in the discussion. The decision of the Supreme Court has somewhat cleared the horizon in New York State.

This conflict of jurisdiction produces some curious results. One resident of New York moved to Connecticut, and, after living there some little time, found a lady who pleased him more than his wife. He procured a divorce in Connecticut. The wife paid no attention to the service of process by publication and mailing, probably hailing with delight the prospect of freedom from the bonds of matrimony. He then married the newly discovered affinity. She, not being familiar with New York decisions, supposed that a marriage acknowledged in Connecticut by law and by her friends was legal anywhere. On her husband's death some years later she found, however, that neither she nor her children had any share in his real estate in New York.

The wife of a New Yorker took up a residence in Rhode Island and obtained a divorce there. The husband refused to accommodate her by having an attorney appear for him in the action. She, being the richer of the two, was able to take the children to Europe. After some years she returned to New York with one of her children for a temporary visit, and the New York court determined that her husband had an equal right in his children without respect to the Rhode Island decree.

In numerous cases men and women have obtained decrees of divorce in Western States for trivial causes, and after marrying again have found themselves defendants in an action of divorce for adultery in the State of New York. Married couples living in New York, weary of the matrimonial bond, find it a simple matter, if both are of the same mind, to procure a divorce by having one move to another State, where failure to support is a ground for divorce. A story is told of one man who paid a double fee to an attorney in Newport, Rhode Island—one for services in having his wife bring an action of divorce against him in Massachusetts, an adjoining State, and another for services in procuring the divorce in Rhode Island of another lady from her husband so as to enable him to marry her soon after the two decrees of divorce had been granted.

It can readily be understood that it is necessary for anyone taking a divorced man or woman as a husband or wife to have his, or her, right to re-marry examined into by a lawyer as a purchaser would have the title to a house examined into before he accepts the deed.

The two most important considerations in any discussion of divorce are the future of the children and the support of the wife. When a woman marries she has a right, as a rule, to look to her husband for her future support. This is amply provided for by the statutes of the various States. Although a wife can only procure a divorce in New York by proving adultery on the part of her hus-

band—a matter far from easy to prove, however aroused her suspicions may be—she can procure a separation [5] in that State for various causes, and the decree of separation can be made to provide suitable support for herself and her children.[6]

The distinction between the New York rule and the more liberal rules of other States brings us to the question whether it is advisable to give people who are unhappily married the opportunity of re-marrying after they have agreed that they can no longer live together.

If there are no children, it seems to be to the interest of morality that the courts should allow re-marriage—that is, give a decree of divorce rather than one of separation.

It is odd that in no State has the question of existence of children made any difference in the statutory provisions.

If people have entered into marriage with the prospect of having children, they give a pledge not only to each other, but to their children. The parties should be allowed to release each other from the pledge as far as they are concerned, but they should not be allowed to release each other from the pledge to the children for the causes, sometimes trivial, which are considered valid in some States of the union.

A less important consideration in divorce is that of alimony. A motion was recently made in court by a husband to be relieved from paying alimony, as since his divorce his former wife had married four other men and was about to marry a fifth. He claimed that, as he was the first victim of the divorce habit, he should be relieved from paying alimony. There is ample room for improvement in the law by providing that alimony should cease when the wife marries again. A woman may be entitled to have one man toil for her support, but not to have two.

The evil effects of easy divorce are perhaps more noticeable in the society of Newport, where a comparatively few people meet frequently at dinners or other entertainments where a divorced ex-partner is likely to appear. One can see there a daughter who is not on bowing terms with her own father. A clever young woman there,

[5] The provisions are as follows: An action may be maintained by a husband or wife against the other party to the marriage, to procure a judgment separating the parties from bed and board for ever, or for limited time, for either of the following causes:

1. The cruel and inhuman treatment of the plaintiff by the defendant.
2. Such conduct on the part of the defendant towards the plaintiff as may render it unsafe and improper for the former to cohabit with the latter.
3. The abandonment of the plaintiff by the defendant.
4. Where the wife is plaintiff, the neglect or refusal of the defendant to provide for her.

[6] In New York a marriage may be annulled for the following causes existing at the time of the marriage: (1) That one of the parties had not attained the age of legal consent. (2) That one of the parties was at the time legally married. (3) That one of the parties was a lunatic. (4) That the consent of one of the parties was obtained by force, duress, or fraud. (5) Where one of the parties was physically incapable of entering into the marriage state.

on being asked which Miss X. she was, answered, 'Oh, I am the only Miss X. who has two fathers and two mothers.'

Divorce granted between parents must have a bad effect on the children, and too liberal divorce laws for parents are sure in future generations to prove injurious to the community where they are too readily granted.

G. Willett Van Nest.

MILTON'S 'DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE OF DIVORCE'

PARADISE LOST appears likely to last as long as the English language, possibly on account of that very fault which the legendary wrangler is said to have found with it—that it 'proves nothing.' Perhaps it is for exactly the opposite reason to this—viz. because they prove far more than most people at all want to believe—that Milton's four pamphlets on divorce have been allowed to lie in the decent obscurity of the student's shelves, glanced at perhaps by the examinee who is aiming at a degree in literature, but generally regarded as regrettable incidents in the life of an otherwise admirable man. Anyone, however, who brings an open mind to the study of these little-known works will probably come to the conclusion that Milton's genius is as fully apparent in them as in anything he wrote. It is, of course, absurd to compare the stately music of 'the organ voice of England,' as it peals through his verse, with the somewhat crabbed and occasionally turgid style of his polemical works, but when we consider the matter rather than the form, there can be no question that the ideas contained in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* are more calculated to benefit the human race than all the pseudo-theology and anachronistic metaphysics of the greatest English epic.

Milton's clearness of sight and freedom from conventional trammels are as evident in his divorce tracts as in either of his better-known prose works, the *Areopagitica*, written in favour of the freedom of the Press, and the *Eikonoklastes*, an exposition of the fallacies inherent in the theory of the divine right of kings. The Press to-day is as free as any reasonable man can wish to see it (though whether it makes an entirely honest or wise use of its freedom is quite another matter), and the doctrine of divine right is, except in the imagination of a few amiable and quite harmless *poseurs*, as dead as the monarchs who maintained it. Both these steps on the road to perfect freedom are due in no small degree to Milton's outspoken championship; but the third great cause which he had at heart has in its essentials made but little progress during the last 250 years. The reason is not far to seek; indeed, Milton, in the address to Parliament which he

prefixes to his first tract, lays his finger with his usual insight on the chief obstacle he has to surmount in his attack on the saddest, because the most intimate, of all the states of bondage to which mankind is subjected. 'If it were seriously asked,' he says, 'who of all the teachers and masters that have ever taught hath drawn the most disciples after him both in religion and manners, it might not be untruly answered, Custom.' What would-be reformer from Christ downwards has not bitterly bewailed the homage paid to this falsest of all false gods, whose ponderous bulk lies crossways to every road and will not stir till the whole people rise and shatter it? Thus it has been throughout the course of history, from the days of Anaxagoras, entitled to an honourable distinction as being the earliest recorded instance of martyrdom in the cause of science, to the present day in India, where the Christian missionary is loud in his complaints of the *dastur* which he finds confronting him at every turn, possibly without any suspicion that he is himself the victim of another *dastur*, which, if more enlightened, is no less exigent, and at times no less vindictive.

From the first Milton was aware of the unpopularity of the cause he was advocating, but, none the less, he says 'the duty and the right of an instructed Christian calls me through the chance of good or evil report to be the sole advocate of a discountenanced truth'; for truth, as he says a little later, 'never comes into the world but like a bastard, to the ignominy of him that brought her forth.' He knew, moreover, what all those have found who before or since have touched the thorny question of the relations between the sexes, that his efforts to remove 'an unreasonable wrong and burden from the perplexed life of our brother' would give no small satisfaction to the 'brood of Belial,' who hoped therein to find some cover for their own debaucheries; but he warns all such that 'honest liberty is the greatest foe to dishonest license.'

In this same preface appears one of those pathetic and futile appeals which every man convinced of his own integrity is apt to make to his opponents, the entreaty that they will credit him with the same honesty of purpose as themselves, and believe that he is no less impelled by his conscience to assail existing institutions than they are impelled by theirs to maintain them. There must ever be enmity between those who are engaged in a lifelong search for truth, and those who consider themselves definitely and finally, so far as this world is concerned, to be in possession of 'the truth'; but it is certainly in favour of the attacking party that any bitterness and want of charity which may be introduced into the struggle do not, as a rule, proceed from them. Argument would become of more use to the world were all disputants to take to heart Milton's appeal that his opponents should either 'answer solidly or be convinced.'

The opposition which is aroused by any attempt to alter the marriage laws could hardly be greater if the reformers designed to separate forcibly all married people, even those who are quite contented with their lot. The wildest reformer will presumably allow that there are a few quite happy marriages, and a large number which are, on the whole, satisfactory to both parties; but he would at the same time claim that in many instances the union has resolved itself, in Milton's phrase, into "a drooping and disconsolate household captivity without refuge or redemption,' and it is these cases which he claims the law should relieve, in spite of the opposition offered by the unthinking in the name of religion and morality. Can it be that those people who protest so loudly do not feel quite sure of the affection of those to whom they are united—are perhaps a little glad that that is not the only bond between them?

That the law of England should be so loth to restore any ill-matched pair to freedom and happiness Milton ascribes to the Canon Law, which had usurped the right to regulate a matter purely civil in its origin, and in a moment pregnant with unhappy consequences had made the discovery that marriage was a sacrament, 'doubtless by the policy of the devil, to make that gracious ordinance become insupportable; that what with men not daring to venture upon wedlock, and what with men wearied out with it, all inordinate license might abound.' It is unfortunate that the Parliament of Edward the Sixth, which had the insight to perceive that, despite the Canon Law, marriage was no sacrament, had not also the courage to relegate it to its proper sphere as a civil institution. It is all but certain, however, that had the young king lived the marriage laws would have been considerably relaxed; for a royal commission had recommended that, among other causes, *capitales inimicitiæ* should be deemed a valid ground for divorce, which phrase presumably does not necessarily mean such a degree of enmity as leads to homicide, but rather that deep-seated antagonism which Milton tries to establish as a ground for divorce. The Commissioners recognised that it was injurious both to the State and to the individual that two people, between whom there existed a fundamental antagonism in tastes, interests, and ideals, should be kept by law in a union which had become distasteful to both of them. For the atmosphere of such a household could foster neither good citizens nor fine characters. Royal Commissions, however, are presumably appointed more for the sake of proving that there does exist a certain amount of enlightened opinion in the country, than with the object of providing a basis for practical legislation. Wherefore it is perhaps not to be wondered at that the recommendations made in the days of Edward the Sixth are still awaiting fulfilment under Edward the Seventh.

Milton's arguments fall under two heads. In the first book he

details the various reasons, based on equity and true morality, why divorce should be allowed to those who desire it; in the second he sets to work to prove that the Mosaic freedom of divorce was not curtailed by Christ.

Accepting as literally true the account of the institution of marriage given in the second chapter of Genesis, he takes as his first point the declared object of marriage as there given, that man should have 'an help meet for him,' since it was not good that man should be alone; 'the chiefest and noblest end in marriage being a happy conversation.' From this it follows that if one's loneliness is not diminished but rather increased by the society of husband or wife, such a union is no real marriage, as failing in the purpose for which it was instituted. It is surely a strange thing that the law should allow a marriage to be annulled for the physical inability of either party to gratify the other, but will take no account of the more serious defects of mind which, to all but the mere animal, bring more unhappiness into the house than any 'enforced chastity.'

To those who argue that it is a man's business to make himself acquainted with a woman's disposition before marriage, he makes the pertinent inquiry whether it is not generally the chaste and modest who make the greatest mistakes in this matter; for those who have lived loosely are saved by the knowledge they have gained in their amours, whereas one who has spent a blameless youth and looked forward to a contented marriage as his chief earthly comfort,

> when he shall find himself bound fast to an uncomplying discord of nature, or, as it oft happens, to an image of earth and phlegm, with whom he looked to be the co-partner of a sweet and gladsome society, and sees withal that his bondage is now inevitable, though he be almost the strongest Christian, he will be ready to despair in virtue and mutiny against Divine Providence; and this, doubtless, is the reason of those lapses and that melancholy despair which we see in many wedded persons, though they understand it not or pretend other causes, because they know no remedy.

It is not mere corporeal union which can do away with that 'God-forbidden loneliness' which marriage was designed to cure, for the essence of marriage 'consists not in a forced cohabitation and counterfeit performance of duties, but in unfeigned love and peace. This peace can only be found where love is mutual, for, when once love's eyes are opened, there can be left of wedlock nothing but the empty husk of an outside matrimony as undelightful and unpleasing to God as any other kind of hypocrisy; for to retain still and not be able to love is to heap up more injury,' just as 'not to be beloved and yet retained is the greatest injury to a gentle spirit. He, therefore, who seeks to part is one who highly honours the married life and would not stain it.' For 'it is a less breach of wedlock to part with wise and quiet consent betimes than still to soil and profane that mystery of joy and union with a polluting sadness and perpetual

distemper; for it is not the outward continuing of marriage that keeps whole that covenant, but whosoever does most according to peace and love, whether in marriage or in divorce, he it is that breaks marriage least, it being so often written that "Love only is the fulfilling of every command." ' Indeed, the reason which urges a man to divorce is 'equal to the best of those that could first warrant him to marry,' since it is 'the loneliness which leads him still powerfully to seek a fit help.'

This will serve as a fitting answer to those numerous people who go the length of allowing man and wife to part where they cannot live in harmony, but will forbid them to find other partners more congenial. Doubtless it is a great gain to be freed from distasteful company; but who will assert that a man or woman thus condemned to solitude is enabled to make the best use of his or her life? Under the present law ill-yoked pairs are thrust into the horrible alternative of having children by those for whom they can feel neither respect nor affection, or leaving unsatisfied what is one of the strongest and purest of all human instincts. Can it be wondered at that the birth-rate is declining if men have too much self-respect and too much pity for the unborn to propagate by wives they despise, and too great fear of the stigma cast by illegitimacy to make other women the mothers of their children? And apart from the question of children, if characters, like all other natural productions, develop best in suitable surroundings, how can it be right to say to one who has made a false start, 'Your life shall be crippled; your struggles after happiness thwarted; we will, so far as we can, hinder your efforts to retrieve your mistake'? And yet this is what law, morality, and public opinion combine to say—doubtless a potent trio, though they carry less weight as soon as they are recognised as the offspring of one mightier still, the great god Custom, through whom they live, and move, and have their being.

This, indeed, is the next point which Milton makes. As the priests of old were forbidden to grieve overlong lest their sacred functions should suffer, so every man, inasmuch as he is a 'person dedicate to joy and peace,' becomes incapable of leading a useful life if he is suffering from such a 'bosom affliction as this, crushing the very foundations of his inmost nature, when he shall be forced to love against a possibility and use a dissimulation against his soul in the perpetual and ceaseless duties of a husband.' Such a self-sacrifice is not only an outrage against morality, it is a defiance of nature; for surely it is 'the most injurious and unnatural tribute that can be extorted from a person endued with reason to be made to pay out the best substance of his body, and of his soul too, as some think, when either from just and powerful causes he cannot like, or from unequal causes finds not recompense.' For 'there is a hidden efficacy of love and hatred in man as well as in other kinds,

not moral but natural, which, though not always in the choice, yet in the success of marriage will ever be most predominant; as says the author of *Ecclesiasticus*, "A man will cleave to his like."'

What lies at the root of the personal attraction or repulsion which exists between certain men and certain women, Milton very wisely makes no effort to determine, all that is necessary for his purpose being the admission that too often between a man and woman there exists a fundamental and irremediable antagonism, though unhappily for some fleeting weeks it has often been sufficiently obscured by veils of vanity or passion to allow them to make the cardinal mistake of entering into a lifelong union.

A very large number of people indeed are not suited for marriage at all, a fact which unhappily very often is not apparent until after the bond has been tied; in which connection it is sad to reflect how few marriages are entered on freely on both sides. What with the persuasion of friends, the pressure brought to bear by parents and other relations, and, above all, the unscrupulous and selfish pursuit of one party by the other, it may safely be said that only a minority of marriages, among educated people at all events, are entered on from the free choice of the two persons chiefly concerned.

In marriage, as in all else, the higher law must be taken to overrule the lower. Just as the command to keep the Jewish Sabbath is subject to an exception where the good of man is concerned, so 'to enjoin the indissoluble keeping of a marriage found unfit, against the good of man both soul and body, is to make an idol of marriage, to advance it above the worship of God and good of man.'

No doubt in the seventeenth century, as in the twentieth, a large proportion of the unsuitably married, lacking the courage to break their fetters, philosophically resolved to make the best of a bad bargain, though, true to the spirit of the age, they preferred to describe their position as an affliction sent by God 'for a trial of their patience.' Milton, while admitting that any trouble may be so regarded, urges that 'God sends remedies as well as evils; under which he who lies and groans, that may lawfully acquit himself, is accessory to his own ruin.'

> Which of Job's afflictions [he asks] were sent him with that law that he might not use means to remove any of them if he could? And what if it subvert our patience and our faith too? Who shall answer for the perishing of all those souls—perishing by stubborn expositions of particular and inferior precepts, against the general and supreme law of Charity?

He concludes his first book with a solemn warning to those who are 'still bent to hold this obstinate liberality' to beware lest they should be held at the last day to have bound grievous burdens on men's shoulders by 'committing two ensnared souls inevitably to kindle one another, not with the fire of love, but with a hatred irre-

concilable, who, were they severed, would straight be friends in any other relation.' For 'it may so fall out that the true church may unwittingly use as much cruelty in forbidding to divorce as the church of antichrist doth wilfully in forbidding to marry.'

In his second book Milton discusses those passages of Scripture in which Christ is supposed by the majority of Christian people to have so far settled the law of divorce as to render it superfluous to debate whether the interests of morality are best consulted by refusing divorce for anything but adultery. Probably the people who are prepared to take up this position are fewer to-day than in Milton's time; not that we have any less reverence for the character or teaching of Christ, but because we are more awake to the fact that his teaching was designed for a moral rather than a legal code. Did not a candid bishop once assert that no State which tried to put in practice the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount could possibly last a fortnight? It might, therefore, be enough to say that it is no more the duty of the State to base its divorce laws on a dictum of Christ's than to forbid affidavits because he said 'Swear not at all.' Can those who consider the marriage laws as settled once and for all by Christ give any adequate reason why they do not turn the cheek to the smiter, allow themselves to be robbed with impunity, and refuse to resist an unjust claim brought against them in a court of law? Why do they not consider it their duty to hate their wives and children, and to forsake all that they have, taking no thought for the morrow? If they plead that it is in the interests of society or morality that they do not act in this manner, they can hardly refuse to grant Milton a hearing when he argues that it is equally against the interests of morality that the marriage laws should be based on a slavish following of the letter of Christ's words. The Quakers and those other denominations who try to carry out literally the commands of Christ are the only people who have any right to defend the existing laws by arguments drawn from his teaching.

But Milton is not prepared to admit that the popular interpretation of Christ's words is correct. It is inconceivable that if divorce were wrong God would have allowed—and, indeed, facilitated it—for so many centuries. If second marriages were adulterous in the days of Christ, they must have been so in the days of Moses, who yet, acting as God's mouthpiece, permitted them. How is it possible for Christ to have declared that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil, if he meant to make so radical a change in domestic life?

The true inwardness of Christ's meaning, as Milton points out, is seen in his command not to sunder those whom God has joined; not those who are joined by their own consent and their friends' approval, nor yet those who are united by the rites of the Church—'for the efficacy of those depends upon the presupposed fitness of

either party'—but those who are joined by God; and whether this may be asserted of any pair depends on whether their minds 'are fitly disposed and enabled to maintain a cheerful conversation to the solace and love of each other.' The fact that a husband and wife cannot live in decent harmony proves that in their case the union was certainly not made by God; 'for wherein can God delight, wherein be worshipped, wherein be glorified, by the forcible continuing of an improper and ill-yoking couple? He that loved not to see the disparity of cattle at the plough cannot be pleased with vast unmeetness in marriage.'

There is an important distinction drawn by Aristotle between those evils which it is the business of the law to remedy and those which, in Milton's phrase, 'are too far within the soul to be cured by constraint of law and are left only to be wrought on by conscience and persuasion.' The question of divorce clearly belongs both by the law of God and by the law of nations to this latter class, and it is only by papal encroachments that the courts of justice have been authorised to 'toss about and divulge the secret reason of disaffection between man and wife,' which is 'a thing most improperly answerable to any such kind of trial,' where the most private details of a man's life are disclosed to a gaping public, and every little wrong is 'aggravated in open court by hired masters of tongue-fence.'

Though little or no result has been achieved by Milton's brave attempt to establish the marriage laws on a juster basis, there can be little doubt that in time the reform he advocated will be carried out. Probably, as one of Milton's editors suggests, the majority of people at the present time are too much engaged in making money to take very much interest in domestic questions; but when the wave of mammon-worship has swept by, and men and women bestow the same care on their characters that they now give to their incomes, the framers of the laws—who will long ere that date have ceased from fretful party strife, and will have as their single aim the happiness of the people they govern—will see the folly and injustice of holding two people to a contract which is injurious and distasteful to both of them. If they will then but listen to the voice of reason and nature

they shall raise many helpless Christians from the depth of sadness and distress, utterly unfitted as they are to serve God or man. They shall set free many daughters of Israel, not wanting much of her sad plight whom Satan had bound eighteen years, Man they shall restore to his just dignity and prerogative in nature, preferring the soul's free peace before the promiscuous draining of a carnal rage. Marriage, from a perilous hazard and snare, they shall reduce to be a more certain haven and retirement of happy society.

It is impossible to read this strong, brave appeal, unanswered and unanswerable, and look round at the useless and needless un-

happiness of so many married lives to-day, without recalling Wordsworth's lines:

> Milton, thou should'st be living at this hour;
> England hath need of thee; she is a fen
> Of stagnant waters; altar, sword, and pen,
> Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower
> Have forfeited their ancient English dower
> Of inward happiness. We are selfish men;
> Oh! raise us up, return to us again,
> And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.

C. B. WHEELER.

'LA JEUNE CAPTIVE'

When André Chénier was being led to the revolutionary scaffold he uttered some last words which (according to one version) are thus translatable: 'I die, but I have something here,' touching his forehead. What was the 'something'? Had he, at that supreme moment, been struck with a tardy suspicion of the possession of that fine poetic genius which it took France twenty-five years longer to discover, and to acknowledge with admiration? Or was he alluding to his undying love for the Countess de Coigny—*La Jeune Captive* of his vivid imagination—who had bewitched him in the prison where they had both been recently confined? Most probably the former; possibly the latter, but if so how strange!

It is doubtful if the lady was really entitled to be called 'Countess de Coigny,' but that was a small matter in the days when countesses were plentiful and cheap, and the title had not necessarily any relation to high birth or personal merits. It was, however, a sufficient matter to help as an excuse for an arrest at a time when those in power often found it easier to cut off heads than formulate accusations. And Madame de Coigny had not only the misfortune of being a sort of aristocrat, but had likewise given expression to anti-revolutionary sentiments.

Chénier was imprisoned on much the same grounds. He had lived a good deal abroad, and took little interest in political matters until his return to Paris in 1790. He then found all his family—a large and intellectual one, half Greek and half French—infected by the new ideas and enchanted with the dawning glories of the Revolution. He himself had a philosophical preference for monarchical principles, such as he had seen in operation in England, and spoke and wrote in their favour—not always with philosophical temper. It was not that he had any irreconcilable objection to the new ideas, but he soon began to hate, despise and denounce the men and the means by which they were being promulgated and enforced. For a time he was left undisturbed—probably by virtue of the redeeming graces of his family, probably, too, because he was not deemed a politician of importance.

His arrest, when it did take place, was curiously accidental, and was attended by some enlightening and grimly amusing incidents.

It had not been ordered, and he was not being sought out by the bloodhounds of the 'Sûreté,' but he happened to cross a trail they were following up, and, missing their designed prey, they seized upon him rather than return empty-handed to their employers. What happened was this: whilst living quietly and obscurely at Versailles it came to his knowledge that his friend, M. Pastoret of Passy, was in danger of arrest, and he hastened to warn him. But the fortunate Pastoret had had an earlier notice, and had already disappeared when Chénier reached his house. Before Chénier could get away, the satellites of the Passy Comité of Sûreté invaded the place in search of M. Pastoret. They could not find him, but they found instead a stranger who, by his dress, bearing and language, appeared to be a gentleman, and therefore a suspicious character, and a probable legitimate prey. They plied him with questions as to his business there and his relations with the missing man.

The *procès-verbal*, in its original barbarous French, is extant and affords some choice bits of curious reading. Chénier told them that M. Pastoret was an acquaintance of his, that he had met him on several occasions five or six years before, and that he had occupied the house next door (*maison à côté*) to him.

His interrogators advised him not to try to deceive them on that point; they knew the whole neighbourhood well, and there was no house there called 'Maison accoté' (*sic*).

Chénier explained that he meant the neighbouring house—the next-door house. This failed to enlighten or satisfy them; he had twice spoken of a 'Maison accoté' which had no existence. What did he mean by it?

Chénier lost his temper, called them imbeciles (they carefully wrote that down), refused to answer further questions, and declined to sign the ridiculous *procès-verbal*. So they carried him off to prison as clearly a 'suspect,' and a prisoner he remained until the guillotine claimed him.

Such tipsy Dogberrys (probably of foreign origin) were the kind of men employed by the local revolutionary committees to watch over the interests of the Republic, and safeguard the holy principles of liberty and fraternity!

No proper conception of the state of things then existing in France can be formed unless two things are kept prominently in view: first, that those uncontrolled and irresponsible inquisitions (the Comités of Sûreté), endowed with plenary powers, existed in every town and village and rural district of France; secondly, that they not only rendered the Reign of Terror possible, but were the active cause of its inauguration. But for them Robespierre and the other Terrorists could not have gone as far as they did, and probably would not have desired or thought of doing so. They were so insatiably bloodthirsty that even the butcher Tallien, at Bordeaux, had once to say to a

deputation of them: 'Go back to those who sent you, and tell them that I am not a man-eater.'

It was in the crowded and filthy prison of St. Lazare (formerly a convent), where they were herded together for four months, that André Chénier and Madame de Coigny became acquainted. It was there that he made her the subject of the beautiful ode—a masterpiece in its way—which he entitled *La Jeune Captive*. French poetic literature hardly contains anything of this kind of composition superior in sweetness, tenderness and poetic imaginings—except, perhaps, Malherbe's lines on the death of Mlle. du Perrier.

It is the *Jeune Captive* herself who is made to speak—to speak as a beautiful and guileless young girl, detained in prison and terrified at the prospect of death:

L'épi naissant mûrit de la faux respecté;
Sans crainte du pressoir, le pampre tout l'été
Boit les doux présents de l'aurore;
Et moi, comme lui belle, et jeune comme lui,
Quoique l'heure présente ait de trouble et d'ennui,
Je ne veux pas mourir encore.

The bright illusions of youth yet dwell in her breast, in spite of the gloom of her prison; she would sing and fly with the joyous nightingale just escaped from the net of the cruel fowler; she is the brilliant flower of the garden just enjoying the rays of the morning sun, and claiming to live until evening; her journey of life has but begun, and the way is still strewn with fresh verdure and sweet flowers—why may she not continue it a little longer? Why should Death seek her out when there are so many who do not fear him, who would welcome him—the old and weary, the unfortunate, the unhappy? And again and again she raises the child-like wail: 'Je ne veux pas mourir encore!' But no summary, nor more ample translation, suffices to do justice to this fine composition in its original form.

Its literary merits are not, of course, affected by any mere want of agreement discoverable between the picture of *La Jeune Captive* as drawn by the poet and the actual person as she existed at the time. Yet one could have wished that the physical and moral difference was not so great—not quite so abysmal. Rarely has love been so blind, or poetic license so severely strained.

At the time when Madame de Coigny was made the subject of the poem she was certainly not a rosebud, a green ear of corn, a tender vine shoot, nor was she just at the pleasant beginning of the journey of life, nor an immature young girl. Oh no! She was married ten years before the Revolution—a first time—and had been subsequently divorced—a first time also—before she met Chénier. She had abandoned her married name of Fleury and resumed her maiden name of Coigny. Not many women, even of her day of almost

general immorality, had as many amatory adventures; and neither in character, conduct nor person had she anything in keeping with Chénier's idea of her as a guileless young girl untainted by gross worldly experiences. Charms of another kind she must undoubtedly have possessed, otherwise her career might have been different, and her husbands and lovers less numerous. Even in prison Chénier was not her only admirer. Another fellow-prisoner, M. Montrond, a gentleman of fortune, was a candidate for her veteran affections. The man of means triumphed over the man of mind. He secured the lady's preference, and on their release from prison they got married, but only to be divorced later on.

It cannot be charged against Madame de Coigny that she trifled with Chénier's affections or deceived him in any amatory sense. There is nothing to show that she ever encouraged him or pretended to love him—if she had much love left for anyone. She liked the young man well enough, no doubt; he was not handsome, but he was intellectual and romantic, and it was pleasant to have him worshipping at her feet and writing nice poetry about her, and about what she was not. That seemed to be about the extent of Madame's attachment for Chénier, and it was quite superficial. When he presented her with the lines on the *Jeune Captive* she was grateful and appreciative, though she could hardly have recognised the portrait as a good likeness. It is equally doubtful if she (though claiming to be *une femme de lettres*) recognised the poetic merits of the composition, or had any suspicion that it would confer immortality on her memory. At any rate she did not prize the copy sufficiently to keep it, or take much care of it after André's death, and, but for the fancy of a M. Millin, a fellow-prisoner to whom she handed it on leaving prison, the poem might have disappeared for ever. But it was preserved, and many years afterwards it came under the notice of M. de Chateaubriand, who saw at once that it was the production of a rare genius. All that could be found of Chénier's writings were collected and published (by Latouche) in a volume which appeared in 1819, and the world then first became aware of the fact that the Revolution had destroyed one of the greatest of French poets, and the only good poet of the Revolutionary epoch.

In the earlier part of the year 1794 the outrageous *loi des suspects* had filled to overflowing the prisons of Paris and all France. New prisons had to be constituted, and everywhere old palaces, châteaux, forts, churches, monasteries, convents, lunatic asylums—any large building, suitable or unsuitable, that could be secured—were turned into places of detention, mostly as insanitary and abominably filthy as St. Lazare, where Chénier and Madame de Coigny were confined with some eight hundred others. The Revolution had pulled down one Bastille and replaced it by a thousand—more crammed with prisoners, who were more wrongfully detained, worse accommodated,

and in far greater peril than any prisoners ever confined in the grim old fortress of the monarchy. As the numbers increased, efforts were made to diminish the overcrowding by sending prisoners wholesale to the guillotine. In two days—the 7th and 8th Thermidor—over eighty were decapitated; but (all unforeseen and unexpected) a day of more merciful general gaol delivery was at hand. Meanwhile the only chance for the individual prisoner was to keep quiet—*il fallait se faire oublier ou périr* (Latouche).

Marie-Joseph Chénier, André's brother, was aware of this, and strongly advised the family to make no effort on André's behalf, so as not to direct attention to him. Marie-Joseph, who was in friendly relation with some of the Terrorists, had no doubt reasons for thinking that a great change would shortly take place in the government, and that a few days' delay would make a vast difference in the fate of the mass of prisoners. It did so in fact.

But the distracted father of the brothers could not keep still. He presented petitions and memorials in favour of André's release, and exhausted his own influence and that of his friends in individual appeals to those in authority. He could not have done worse. His feverish anxiety had the effect of reminding the revolutionary commissioners that André Chénier was in existence, and of suggesting that his case had better be settled out of hand. It was settled by his condemnation and death.

When the father heard the dreadful news of his son's condemnation he flew to the house of Barère, forced a way to his presence, threw himself on his knees, and besought him to order the name of André to be erased from the death list. Barère remained for a time silent and impassive, but at last made answer: '*Ton fils sortira dans trois jours.*' Was this a practical joke—inconceivably inhuman—played upon the afflicted father, or was there sincerity in the promise? The Revolution had brought to the surface a set of wretches who were quite capable of such brutal pleasantry, and there is no good reason for thinking that Barère was not one of the kind. But it is not impossible, and it may be hoped, that he spoke in good faith but was obliged to be oracular. Like Marie-Joseph he probably 'knew something,' and had reason to think that all the remaining 'suspects' would be released within three days. He and Tallien and others were conspiring for Robespierre's overthrow. It is conceivable then that he desired to comfort the distracted father with a positive assurance without compromising himself, or taking the old man into dangerous confidence. Such confidence would, moreover, be needless, for the kind purpose (if it existed) would be sufficiently served by the solemn assurance: 'Your son will come out in three days.' But the expected counter-revolution was retarded, and though Chénier came out of his prison within the three days, it was only to go to the guillotine—on the 7th Thermidor (25th of July, 1794); on the

9th the carnival of blood came to an end. Another day's delay would have saved him!

Meanwhile *la Jeune Captive* had been more fortunate. Her other prison lover, Montrond, had made a timely and judicious distribution of a hundred pieces of gold, whereby he procured the erasion of his own and her name from the list of victims ordered for execution. In this way they gained a respite of some days, and saved their lives. In that way, too, the life of Chénier might well have been saved if the *Jeune Captive* had only thought of it, and was willing to part with the money.

Marriage to Montrond, and then divorce, quickly followed her release from prison. Any slight restraints which matrimony might have imposed on her were removed by the divorce, and *elle eut ensuite une existence assez orageuse*, as one of her biographers delicately puts it. In the course of that stormy life she further augmented the list of her many lovers, amongst the new additions being the English Lord Malmesbury; the last of them was M. Bruno de Boisgelin. She died in 1820, not much over fifty years of age, and to the end (as the same polite biographer says) the 'Captive of love.' She will ever be remembered—perhaps with some amusement—as the inciting cause of poor Chénier's beautiful ode, and for nothing else.

DOMINICK DALY.

THE 'SPECTATOR' EXPERIMENTAL COMPANY[1]

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EXPERIMENT AND SOME LESSONS OF IT

1. THE United Kingdom cannot afford to maintain a Regular Army sufficiently numerous to meet all possible, or even probable, emergencies. Compulsory service, although involving a considerable saving in the rates of pay, would not meet the case, because the troops required for oversea garrisons must in any case be enlisted by voluntary methods, and their numbers do not now greatly exceed the necessary minimum, after providing a reasonable margin for 'small wars' and for immediate use on the outbreak of more serious conflicts. Compulsory service prescribes very short service, and consequently the training of very large numbers annually—at great cost. A short-service Regular Army maintained in addition to the necessary establishment of long-service troops would, therefore, involve an increase of the Estimates, against which no reduction of the long-service branch which could safely be made could furnish an appreciable set-off.

2. Great powers of expansion, on mobilisation, could be given to the British Regular Army, as at present constituted, only by means of a multiplicity of very weak *cadres* at home. That is to say, by the adoption of a system identical with or very similar to that advocated by Mr. Arnold-Forster, who proposed to convert seventy-one battalions of the Line and of the Militia into 'short-service' units, through which comparatively large numbers of men, after two years' training with the colours, would be passed into the Reserve. This proposal, although in itself a perfectly sound one, is, nevertheless, unsuitable to our particular case, because the British recruit is usually a boy, only nominally eighteen years of age, whereas the Continental recruit is actually twenty years old when he joins. In the latter circumstances, therefore,

[1] The basis of this article is a series of memoranda which I had compiled for the purposes of a lecture to be delivered at the 'Senior Officers' Conference,' at the Staff College, arranged to take place during the early part of January. Owing to a necessity having arisen to overhaul the drains at the Staff College, the Conference has been postponed *sine die*.—A. W. A. P.

every soldier on the effective strength of the *cadres*, in peace, is of proper age for war, and if sufficiently trained is immediately available for active service; whereas in the former a very large proportion of the strength with the colours is composed of immature lads, whom it would be sheer murder to expose to the hardships of a campaign. The number of reservists required to complete the mobilised units to war establishment would, consequently, be utterly disproportionate to the net strength of the *cadres*. Readiness for immediate service is incompatible with an influx of reservists greatly outnumbering the *cadres* upon which they are formed. Fifty per cent., judging by Continental practice, appears to be the maximum proportion of reservists to serving soldiers that can be reconciled with reasonable efficiency. In 1899, some British battalions, nominally 800 strong, required about 70 per cent. of reservists to complete them for war, and thus used up the whole of their reserves before a shot had been fired! This scarcely encourages us to rely upon *cadres* of similar quality and little more than 500 strong.

3. Having regard to the above considerations, it appears better for us to rely upon quality rather than quantity for our Regular Army, and to endeavour to supply the numbers required to supplement it by means of a cheap Militia army of reserve, behind which, in turn, would stand the Volunteers for purposes of home defence—that is to say, to maintain public confidence and beat off raids. The rifle clubs should form a reserve for the Volunteers, which force would inevitably be absorbed, partially, by an augmented and improved Militia. This, I have been reminded, is a fact that should be stated frankly. The country corps of Volunteers would principally be affected.

4. In the event of a great war, it seems that the functions of the various branches of the Army would be as follows:

Active defence.—The Regular Army, supplemented by the Militia.

Passive defence.—The Volunteers.

But although the Volunteers, as a body, have been set down for passive defence, that is no reason why individual Volunteers should not be encouraged to serve with the active army. Only Volunteer *units* are as such earmarked for home defence. It would be an admirable plan if individual Volunteers were invited annually on the 1st of November to accept a liability for service abroad with their territorial Regular or Militia units in the event of a national emergency arising previous to the 31st day of the following October. It is absolutely idle to suppose that Volunteer units (even if available, which they properly are not) can be rendered, in existing or any possible conditions of peace training, fit to encounter Continental regulars. If this assertion be untrue, why, in the name of common-sense, do we ourselves and other Powers think it needful to spend vast sums of money upon professional troops? History may be searched in vain for examples of Volunteers, however brave and patriotic,

defeating or even holding their own against regulars, unless when having enormous numerical superiority or some other special advantages in their favour. The amateur who gives only a portion of his time to the practice of any profession, calling, or game, can only in rare instances of quite exceptional ability compete successfully with the professional.

5. Assuming that the Militia, together with the Imperial Yeomanry, should be called upon to undertake the supplementary task suggested, it is clear that a large increase of numbers, and an equally great improvement in the quality and training of the existing Militia, must needs be effected. The Militia, instead of being chiefly drawn from the physical and intellectual dregs of the nation, must be recruited from the more numerous as well as preferable classes of society. But if the respectable salary-earning and wage-earning classes are to be attracted, the conditions of service must be altered to suit them, and the disreputable classes rigorously excluded.

6. A given amount of training produces greater results with desirable recruits than with others who are physically and intellectually inferior, and the better class of men, by their superior intelligence, adaptability, and common-sense can shift for themselves to some extent when confronted by problems in the solution of which they are imperfectly instructed or insufficiently experienced. Thus the quality of the recruit may compensate to some extent for incompleteness of training.

7. If the principle be accepted that the Regular Army might advantageously be supplemented by means of an improved and augmented Militia, it remains to consider two questions which naturally arise from the inclination to adopt that principle :

A. Is it possible to arrange conditions of service which the genuine working and other superior classes would accept in sufficient numbers ?

B. Under conditions calculated to ensure such acceptance, is it possible to train the officers and men up to the necessary standard of efficiency ?

8. I venture to think that the *Spectator* experiment, which was undertaken for the very purpose of answering the foregoing questions, has resulted in giving strong evidence in the affirmative in reference to the first, and a complete, indefeasible answer to the second.

I will take each of the questions in turn, and endeavour to explain my reasons for believing that by the *Spectator* experiment both have been satisfactorily answered.

First, as regards question ' A.'

The full strength of the *Spectator* Experimental Company, about one month after its formation, was 105 ; and 102 of the men represented 51 callings and trades, while 3 were of ' no occupation.' There were 12 clerks, 10 labourers, 4 grocers' assistants, 4 porters, 4 butchers, 4 club waiters, 2 carmen, 2 stable lads, 2 gardeners, 2 insurance agents,

2 milkmen, 2 storekeepers, 2 fishmongers, 2 draper's assistants, 2 barmen, 2 post-office employés, 1 checker, 1 copyholder, 1 sailor, 1 stevedore, 1 surveyor, 1 cook, 1 tram-conductor, 1 warehouseman, 1 'weight-lifter' (professional athlete), and the remainder, except the three of 'no occupation,' were artisans of various sorts. These 105 young men may, I think, be accepted as fairly representative of the wage-earning classes. To the company Mr. Strachey issued a series of questions pertinent to the matter now in hand, printed on forms one of which was filled in and signed by each man. I have these forms now before me, and propose to give the collective import of the answers given. The questions asked included the following:

(1) 'What was your object in joining the *Spectator* Experimental Company?' Sixty-two answered, 'for the military training,' and 43, 'for physical benefit.'

(2) 'Did you think it would improve your chances of getting on if you had six months' military training?' One hundred and three 'yes,' 2 'no.'

(3) 'Did you ever think of joining the Militia?' Ninety-eight 'no,' 7 'yes.'

(4) 'Should you like to come out in future for a week's training every year?' Ninety-seven 'yes,' 4 'not decided,' 4 'no.'

(5) 'Do you think that a force like the Militia, but formed from a higher stamp of man and trained like the *Spectator* Experimental Company for six months to begin with, and after that called out only for one week a year—shooting and drill to be done in men's spare time like the Volunteers—would be popular and likely to get recruits?' One hundred and five 'yes.'

Later on in the training I put up a notice asking for the names of those who would be willing to join the Militia, if reorganised, on the following conditions:

(*a*) Engagement for 12 years, including liability to serve abroad in the event of a great war. Only respectable men to be enlisted.

(*b*) Recruit-training 6 months; further battalion service 6½ years, performing 22 drills and exercises and a week in camp annually; 5 years in the Reserve, performing a modified course of musketry only.

(*c*) Pay at Army rates for amount of work done.

(*d*) Training in *Spectator* Experimental Company to be allowed to count as the prescribed recruit's training.

No less than 62 men gave in their names, and of the balance—then 38—about a score had already decided to enlist in the Regular Army, and 4 were going to sea or otherwise going abroad. Up to the present time of writing, 25 have actually joined the Regular Army, although only 8 had before the *Spectator* training intended to do so.

It seems to me that the above facts speak for themselves, and abundantly prove that respectable wage-earning young men would

willingly join the Militia in large numbers under conditions of service that would not interfere, as the comparatively long annual training of the Militia now does, with their means of livelihood. It is perfectly certain that neither employers nor employed can endure a system which requires men to turn out for twenty-seven days at a time, even if the date of training were not arbitrarily fixed by higher authority. Under a system of 'intermittent training' those difficulties vanish. I was talking about a month ago to a manufacturer who employs about 10,000 hands, of whom about 300 apprentices complete their articles annually. This gentleman assured me that he would be only too glad if *all* his apprentices were to undergo such a training as that of the *Spectator* Experimental Company on the completion of their period of apprenticeship; and that he would further be willing that they should serve in the Militia under the conditions already stated. He considered that the moral and physical benefits to be gained by the six months' training would amply repay him for any inconvenience possibly to be occasioned in the event of mobilisation. It need scarcely be pointed out that the foremen, &c., of the factory would, in course of time, become the non-commissioned officers of the Militia unit in which the hands were serving—a great assistance to discipline at all times.

Now for the second question, 'B,' which I admit encounters objections upon several grounds. That the proposed system of intermittent training would produce efficiency as great as, or greater than, that resulting from an annual training I am entirely confident, though some, notably the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Arnold-Forster, deny this. But the real question is whether the original course of six months' training for recruits would suffice to lay an adequate foundation to be built upon by either method. I myself say *yes*, provided that the men are of the right sort, well disposed and reasonably well-educated and intelligent. Sir John French and others were good enough to commend the drill and training of the *Spectator* Experimental Company; and for my own part I can only say that I never commanded smarter soldiers on parade, nor men who had acquired so much *knowledge*. I do not pretend that a fighting unit, fit for immediate service, had been created by the six months' training, and I took pains to dispel any false impressions upon that score in a speech delivered at Sheffield. The young non-commissioned officers, in spite of all their rapidly acquired knowledge, necessarily had not sufficient experience, and they had absolutely no *influence* whatever, so that discipline could not have been properly maintained under the stress of campaigning. Discipline means more than mere willingness to obey; there requires to be the 'habit of discipline,' a virtue that soldiers all understand, but are unable exactly to define. This indispensable habit had not yet been formed in the *Spectator* Experimental Company (although the men implicitly obeyed their officers

and sergeant instructors); but I maintain that in after-service—on Volunteer lines—it would in course of time have been sufficiently developed, by the frequent association of commanders and commanded.

Nobody, I imagine, supposes that Militia units trained as now suggested, or upon any other Militia basis, could be fit to take their places instantly upon the battlefield itself; but they would be fit to relieve *all* Regulars from garrison duty at home and abroad, and to do duty upon the lines of communication, immediately after mobilisation; and after two or three months of final preparation I fully believe that they would be found fit to fight any conscript soldiers in the world. Can we hope to get more than this from any kind of auxiliary forces? An existing unit, though composed of but imperfectly trained individuals, is a better fighting instrument than a hastily created one composed of very much better-trained individuals. A Militia battalion, 1,100 strong, ought, after making full deduction for immature lads, to be capable of producing 800 effectives, and would thus require only 200 reservists (to complete 1,000), of whom probably 150 would have quitted the colours less than a year previously. In the case of Mr. Arnold-Forster's proposed 'short-service battalions' there would, by his own showing, be need for 603 reservists in order to complete a strength of 1,000; hence, in spite of the superior individual value of men who had been soldiers for two years, the collective value of the battalion would, I think, be considerably less; and, moreover, the number of men obtainable for any given annual expenditure would amount to little more than one-third of that which would result from limiting the training of the recruits to six months only.

The officer question, as it arises from both 'A' and 'B,' is answerable in much the same manner as in the case of the men. Professions, like trades, cannot be suspended for twenty-seven days at a time without loss of money; and a course of six months' training on *Spectator* lines would produce far better qualified officers than the majority of those now serving in the Militia or Volunteer forces. The young officers should be trained with the men, with no distinction except as regards the advantage of officers' quarters and messing, and some additional instruction in the theory of war.

9. It seems desirable to recapitulate briefly what I conceive to be the proper functions of a Militia reserve army, and the necessary standard of its efficiency.

On the outbreak of a great war the Militia should be capable of immediate mobilisation, without requiring any reservists except to replace recruits and the medically unfit.

Militia units thus mobilised within, say, forty-eight hours should forthwith be available to relieve Regular units at home and abroad to whatever extent might be required, and to take up duties on the lines of communication. Within two or three months Militia units should be fit to take their places, if required, on the battlefield. I do

not think that units raised and trained on a Militia basis can be made fit to do justice to themselves without some final preparation; yet I would prefer a good Militia battalion composed of, say, 800 serving soldiers and 200 reservists to any ordinary Regular battalion composed of 400 serving soldiers and 600 Regular reservists. Even a Regular battalion composed in equal parts of serving soldiers and reservists would be the better of a few weeks' time to 'shake down.' I consider that the standard of *immediate* efficiency in the Militia should be, and could be, almost comparable with that of the last-mentioned battalion *under the conditions of training that now prevail in the Regular Army*; but I have no doubt that after a month's preparation, in each case, the improvement in the fighting value of the Regular battalion would be at least double that of the Militia battalion.

10. To produce the required standard of training and to assure an adequate supply of recruits I believe that the following conditions would meet the case:

(1) Enlistment 12 years; 7 years with the colours and 5 in the Reserve.

(2) Six months' training on enlistment; 22 drills and exercises and a course of musketry annually, and one week in camp, not less frequently than in alternate years, during the seven years of colour service. Reservists to fire a modified course of musketry only.

(3) The Militia units to be liable for service abroad in the event of a great war.

(4) Pay and allowances at Army rates while in camp, and proportionately for other attendances on parade.

(5) 'Wasters' to be rigorously excluded. This is an essential condition to obtaining the right sort of men.

My original belief in the acceptability of the above conditions has been fortified (as already explained) by the readiness of sixty-two men of the *Spectator* Company to enlist under them, and by the unanimous opinion of the company that those conditions would be popular.

11. I venture to assert that a plain lesson of the *Spectator* experiment is that drill and tactical knowledge quite sufficient for all practical purposes can be taught in six months; and to this I add my opinion that by the system of intermittent training proposed the necessary understanding and experience, and a reasonable approach to the 'habit of discipline,' would be acquired. Those who saw the *Spectator* Company at Aldershot will, I think, admit that if, instead of its own young sergeants and corporals, it had had its sergeant instructors for section leaders, its tactical efficiency, for manœuvre purposes, would probably have left little to be desired. I contend that by the *Spectator* experiment it has been proved that, provided the necessary numbers can be obtained, a reserve army fit to do what is required of it can easily be created. Further than this, I would point out that, from the very fact that the performances of the

Spectator Company, after only six months' training, were deemed satisfactory, it seems to follow that if the captains of Regular companies enjoyed advantages similar to those which I possessed at Hounslow the Regular Army itself would be much more efficient than it is. In proof of this contention I would quote the manifest superiority of Guardsmen over Linesmen, and this I attribute entirely to the more thorough training of the recruit. It will, no doubt, be objected that in the Line the favourable conditions of Hounslow cannot be realised; but this reasoning is fallacious. I had at Hounslow only nine ex-soldiers for fatigue duties; all that these men were unable to do—such as a general cleaning up on Saturday mornings—the recruits themselves had no difficulty in performing without any interference with their attendance at parades being thereby occasioned. There is no squadron or company that has not more than nine old soldiers serving in its ranks. Why should not these men be fully at the disposal of their captain, and be excused, as a rule, from all parades except during the period of the year when battalion or other higher training is in progress? Of course there are garrison duties that *must* be done; but many of these might easily be abolished or altered so as to fit in better with regimental arrangements. The constant activity and interference of staff officers is the greatest obstacle to efficient training. If our generals would only be content to keep an eye upon work done by the regimental officers, instead of preventing it by vain attempts to train the soldiers themselves, we should do far better. The fact is we are running continually, though having never learned to walk. I myself achieved some success at Hounslow solely because, almost for the first time in my life, I was permitted to do my own work in my own way. If we want an efficient army we must allow the regimental officers a free hand during the greater part of the year, and judge them by results to be worthy of promotion, abasement, or rejection. The Army proved itself untrained in South Africa—as testified by Sir Evelyn Wood in vol. ii. p. 252 of his recent autobiography—solely because our officers and men had been so constantly 'messed about' by their generals that they had been prevented from learning their military alphabet. We have some first-rate general officers, in spite of the system under which we groan, but the majority are the natural product of that system. How can men be expected to train or lead brigades when they have never learned properly—and some have never even tried—to train companies? Our system of military education, and the examinations by which it is tested, cannot have the best results, because the authorities overlook the fact that all men are not alike. Some have the science fitting them to be staff officers and generals, while others, though scientifically deficient, possess the requisite art to be good regimental officers; there is room for both, because Admirable Crichtons are very rare.

A. W. A. POLLOCK.

'WINDOW-DRESSING' IN THE MONEY MARKET

THIS subject has been talked about, written about, and argued round and round about for years, and now it seems that something is going to be done.

So much has been said already that a truce to discussion might with advantage be called, pending the appearance of the expected measures of reform, were it not for the existence of misconception in the public mind as to what is the matter with the money market and as to what remedies are needed for its cure. The controversy which has been carried on so long and so vigorously in the City, and in the financial columns of the press, has not been very clearly studied except by those immediately interested; and since, as has been said, there is reason to hope that something is about to be done, it is perhaps worth while to try to put the facts of the case before those who are not brought into daily contact with monetary problems.

Put into a nutshell, the evil to be remedied is the fact, now agreed upon by all parties to the discussion, that London conducts its business as banker to the world at large on an insufficient store of gold. Consequently there arise periods when the measures taken for the protection of its store have to be drastic in their nature and inconvenient in their results. So far unanimity rules among those qualified to debate the matter; disagreement appears when the argument proceeds to decide as to whose fault it is that the store of gold is too small, and at whose expense the defect should be remedied.

But since this article is an attempt to elucidate these matters for those who are not familiar with monetary problems, except those of the inevitable and domestic order, and are compelled, in view of the prospect of legislation on the subject, to acquire a closer acquaintance with them, it may be as well at the outset to give a brief explanation as to why it is that London finds itself in this unquestioned difficulty of being expected to act as banker for the world at large and trying to do so with an insufficient store of gold. Among the many causes which contributed to the more rapid development of banking in Great Britain than in any other country the most obvious are its

long freedom from invasion and internal revolution, and the consequent start that it obtained in the financial and industrial race, an essential part of the training for which is freedom from anxiety on the score of external or internal disturbance. These very patent considerations are, of course, set out in all the text-books on the subject, and merely repeated here to refresh the memory of those who have not recently been under the necessity of studying text-books. A more recondite cause was the early adoption by England of gold as the sole metallic currency for the payment of any debts above a trifling amount, with the result that British finance was freed from all the difficulties and uncertainties experienced by those countries which struggled to maintain both gold and silver as legal tender, and to keep a fixed ratio between them in spite of fluctuations in the supply and demand.

But these are merely accidental influences which time and experience might have been expected to eliminate. And we must look for a deeper cause to explain why it is that, although the more settled conditions of modern civilisation give commerce, and finance its handmaid, a free hand in all the leading countries, and the advantages of a single currency have been admitted by the action of the whole world, commercially considered, yet London still remains the only real banking centre, that is to say, the only centre in which a credit instrument can and must, immediately and without question, be turned into gold on the demand of the holder. Like most other things, the matter is really at bottom one of temperament. The Briton is still not only the best, but in some senses the only Banking Man. This is not written in any spirit of collective self-glorification, though in these days, when it is the fashion to shout 'Ichabod' from the housetops, those of us who are convinced of the soundness of our country's core may be excused for laying a little stress on the fact. The Banking Man, ready to take a huge responsibility and face the consequences with unruffled countenance, but always keeping his head and disinclined to 'see red' under the influence of financial excitement—such a being is not necessarily an ideal result of civilisation, but, such as he is, he is produced most readily by British temperament and training.

In the matter of thrift and in some forms of financial cleverness our friends across the Channel can give us many points and a beating. As hoarders and investors the French are unrivalled, but their habit of mind does not encourage them to take big risks. Apart from occasional and exceptional ebullitions of speculative spirit, they like to play for safety. Consequently, though they walk steadily round the financial billiard table piling up a constant succession of useful twenties and twenty-fives, they seldom bring off a brilliant break. It is not their game, and very likely they are right to prefer their own system, which wins for them a position of enormous strength and solidity and leaves them unexposed to risk and inconvenience. The

net result, however, is that in this matter of banking, Paris makes no pretence at being open for business. She will lend money to any extent on security that she considers good, and her credit is always at the service of an attractive borrower, but her gold she keeps to herself—except on special occasions—retaining the right to meet her obligations in silver token money if it suits her to do so. An issue of Pennsylvania Railroad bonds was recently placed in Paris, and the mere fact was seized on as another instance of the decadence of London; but when New York, being in monetary difficulties, applied for part of the proceeds in gold, Paris produced, not gold, but a draft on London.

In New York we find the other extreme. In boldness and enterprise, and in the fine confidence which will consign costly machinery to the scrap heap on the chance of an improvement, the United States may claim to be ahead of England. But the country suffers from the defects of its qualities, and its very audacity, and aggressive tom-boyish juvenility, lead it to outrun the constable with remarkable regularity and thoroughness. Its abounding natural resources and its high tariff have accumulated enormous resources in the hands of a few individuals, giving them a power which it is difficult to realise on this side of the Atlantic. But it can hardly be contended that that power has been used in a manner calculated to inspire the confidence of others, so essential to the success of the Banking Man. Given steadiness, self-control, and a reasonable currency system, New York might well be a formidable rival to London as a banker. But these things are not given yet.

Finally, Berlin, viewed as a banker, is a dark horse that has never yet been stripped for a gallop, but is only allowed the gentlest exercise, hooded to its ears and sheeted to its tail. With their earnestness of purpose and thoroughness of method, our Teutonic cousins can learn to do most things; and it is possible that Berlin may some day take its place as a considerable financial centre, if only the drill-sergeant exactitude with which its growth is guided gives its limbs sufficient freedom to develop healthy and self-reliant activity. But this, again, is not yet.

When once this cardinal fact is grasped that London is the one centre to which everyone who has a claim for gold can turn with the certainty of immediately converting it into the metal, it is very easy to see why it is that London has recently found some difficulty in maintaining its store. Agricultural and industrial development has been on an enormous scale all over the world. New fields have been opened on every side. Prairies have been turned into *sata læta*, rippling with the smile of harvest, and the pace with which mechanical appliances have been devised and constructed for the service, or destruction, of mankind has been unprecedented. All this has meant a demand for currency and credit, and so for gold

as their basis. Industrial development has at the same time caused a steady appreciation in the prices of raw materials, with the result that still more credit—and so still more gold—has been required to finance production. Everybody has wanted gold and has been ready to sell goods or pledge credit to obtain it; having obtained it, other centres take good care to remove it beyond the reach of buyers, while London, the only free dealer, has been prevented, by circumstances into which our inquiry will shortly lead us, from keeping as much as was desirable of the supply which poured into it from the mines which it owns in the Transvaal and elsewhere.

It is perhaps as well to remark at this stage, that there is nothing sinister or terrifying in all this. So far from its signifying any weakness in London's position, it emphasises its incalculable importance as the world's banking centre. It has, indeed, been suggested that London has undertaken a task that is beyond human power to carry through, and that it ought to follow the example of other centres and close its gold store to foreign claimants; but there is really no need for these counsels of pusillanimity. The business that comes here because of London's position as the only real banker is of enormous extent and highly profitable to those who handle it, and the facilities which London gives to the financiers of other countries makes those of them who have any care for the welfare of the international financial body anxious to do nothing that will cause undue inconvenience in London. Nobody in business wishes to quarrel with his banker, or to put him into an awkward corner; and by being the world's banker London wins the respect and consideration of the world. Moreover it is a mistake to suppose that a great improvement has not already been effected in this matter of the gold store. The general determination that something must now be done is only an indication of the universal desire to make still further progress along a line that has already for many years been taken by the Directors of the Bank of England. Within the memory of business men still active, it used to be thought that all was well as long as the Bank's reserve did not fall below ten millions. Now there is a tendency to take in sail and hoist storm signals when it falls below twenty, simply because it is recognised by the monetary community as a whole that the great increase in London's liabilities on home and foreign account makes it necessary to have a larger store of shot in the locker. This constant excelsior movement in the ideal indicates an alert appreciation of the needs of the situation, which is eminently proper and prudent, and by no means a symptom of uneasiness or apprehension. It is admitted that more has yet to be done, and the City has been searching its own conscience to see whether there are not some weak points in its armour, the strengthening of which would further the achievement of the desired object. And it has found several, and means to mend them.

We have seen that the Bank of England has already achieved a considerable improvement in the level of its reserve which is now regarded with equanimity. It is generally admitted that this improvement has not quite kept pace with the growth of the liabilities of London for which the Bank is expected to provide, but something has at any rate been done. Without any aspersion on the readiness of the Directors to perform their obvious duty, it may reasonably be contended that the healthy publicity to which the Bank's position is subjected by the publication of its weekly account has had something to do with the achievement of the results already secured. At any rate there is good reason to suspect that other banks on which this fierce hebdomadal light does not beat have not recognised their responsibilities to the same extent. In support of this contention we have the unimpeachable authority of Mr. J. Spencer Phillips, the President of the Institute of Bankers, who stated in an address recently delivered to the Institute that though the London bankers no doubt fully recognised the necessity of keeping adequate reserves, this was not the case with many of their country brethren. 'You have only to look,' he added, 'at their half-yearly balance sheets (when it is a reasonable inference that they strive to make the best showing possible) to see what an absolutely inadequate amount of cash some of them keep.'

This evidence against his brethren from the President of the Institute is all the more damning because the tenderness with which he handles the behaviour of the London bankers shows that care for the reputation of his cloth makes him look upon it with a kindlier eye than most of its outside critics. He reminded his audience that sixteen years ago, at the instigation of Lord Goschen, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, twelve of the London banks decided to publish a monthly balance sheet, and he proceeded to state that the result has no doubt been beneficial to them and to the public generally, for whereas, when this publication first began, 10 per cent. of cash was thought a fair average, it has been raised now to about 16 per cent.

This is all, of course, entirely and literally true, but the picture that it conveys of London bankers slowly piling up and maintaining larger cash reserves under the spur of public-spirited duty has been regarded with sceptical amusement by the bill brokers and other sufferers from the system which is commonly known as 'window-dressing,' the prevalence of which has gone far to rob Lord Goschen's reform of the good effect that he hoped to achieve by it.

The system, which is so generally recognised that it has received the above nickname—the common use of which sometimes puzzles readers of money articles who are not initiated into the mysteries of the jargon of Lombard Street—consists of an ingenious practice, by which the banks, or many of them, call in loans from borrowers for twenty-four hours, for the express purpose of making a brave show in

the monthly balance sheets instituted by Lord Goschen. What he intended was that the bankers should keep, as a matter of course, a larger proportion of cash to liabilities every day of their business lives. But the desire of the bankers to make as much profit as possible by keeping as little cash as possible unemployed, taught them that the old unregenerate methods might be pursued, and yet an appearance of austere virtue might at the same time be presented to the public gaze if sufficient cash were called in once a month to figure in the monthly statements. Window-dressing very soon became popular, and if indications, somewhat difficult to trace, can be trusted, has been practised with increasing assiduity. It was not adopted by all the banks; several of them are well known still to present every month a record which shows not only their position on a certain day, but also a fair type of their normal holding of cash against liabilities throughout the period covered. But in some cases this very misleading practice was developed to an extent of perfection which robbed the publication of a balance sheet of all value except as an artistic display, and it began to be expected as a matter of course that towards the end of each month large amounts would be called in by certain banks from the bill brokers and other borrowers to whom they had been lent. The increase in the proportion of cash to liabilities shown in the monthly balance sheets may thus have been accompanied by no improvement whatever in the habitual position of the window-dressing banks on days when their position was not made public.

A further refinement was introduced into the system, when the banks began to be careful to choose different days on which to prepare these edifying exhibitions. The amount called in from the market was thus diminished; but, on the other hand, the period over which inconvenience was caused was greatly extended. The whole system has thus become absurd, and by no means in accordance with the lofty traditions of English banking; and it is not to be wondered at that the President of the Institute of Bankers skated as rapidly as possible over this very thin piece of ice, and preferred to dwell on the delinquencies of his 'country brethren.'

To make the matter quite clear to those not versed in the ways of the City, it should perhaps be explained that the evil complained of most seriously is not the calling in of funds by the banks in order to publish misleading statements, but their practice of lending so freely on the days on which their position is not made public that this calling in is necessary in order to make a show of decency when the light is turned on. It should also be recognised that the fact that only a dozen of the banks adopted Lord Goschen's suggestion is something of an excuse for those of them that subsequently evaded its whole intention by developing the system of window-dressing. For they had to compete with many other dealers in money who were restricted by no considerations of publicity except at the end of each half-year,

when balance sheets are issued by everybody. And the very intensified squeeze for money that takes place at the end of June and December shows very clearly that window-dressing is an important ingredient in the production of many balance sheets besides those of the institutions which are most commonly accused of it. It results from this conclusion that overtrading in credit is habitual throughout the whole of the money-dealing community, with a few important exceptions.

This over-trading in credit is believed to be at the bottom of much of the difficulty that has recently been experienced by the London money market in maintaining a supply of gold sufficient to protect it against recurring periods of apprehension when the stock becomes unpleasantly low, and the sharp upward twists in the price of credit which cause so much inconvenience, when the Bank of England finds it necessary to take measures to protect its reserves. It has already been noted that London is the only centre which is prepared to give gold at once and without question in exchange for any draft upon it that is presented; in consequence of this important fact, many of the cheerful assumptions that ornament the pages of economic text-books are found to be mere will-o'-the-wisps when tested by practical fact. Gold which ought to come to London when exchanges reach a certain point does not do so because it is locked up tightly against exporters, and gold sometimes moves away from London in the teeth of exchange conditions, because somebody in a foreign centre is prepared to import it at a loss, to stimulate local markets or for some such purpose, or because special facilities of an artificial kind are being offered to encourage its importation.

These foreign influences which prevent the movements of gold according to the arrangements made by economic theory cannot, of course, be touched by any reform in London. But London can at least reform out of existence local factors which tend in the same direction, and chief among them is the over-trading in credit of which some of the British banks stand accused, and convicted out of the mouth of the President of their own Institute.

The course of the money market in the past autumn has given ample demonstration of the truth of this contention. Everyone knows that the City has been subjected to the unusual burden of a 6 per cent. Bank rate, and that one of the most important causes of this phenomenon was the extent to which American credits, raised here by borrowing, in one form or another, had been utilised for withdrawals of gold from the Bank of England. New York, when it wants gold, does not work with the tactful *finesse* shown by Parisian financiers, who sometimes take large sums in small weekly driblets out of our bullion market without affecting anybody's nerves. New York comes out with a splash like a special edition, consisting entirely of headlines, and there was one week last autumn in which over three millions were taken from the Bank's vaults for shipment to the United

States. The international money market is not constructed to cope with hobbledehoy freaks on this scale. And though it must be admitted that claims against British insurance companies, on account of losses by fire at San Francisco, gave New York some of its power to draw gold, at the same time it is universally agreed that it was only enabled to indulge itself with such reckless freedom by the extent to which its bills had been accepted and discounted here, and its securities had been financed through the London Stock Exchange. And the extent to which both these operations were carried out was largely due to this same over-trading in credits by the banks.

For it must be remembered that a large proportion of the deposits held by the banks consist of money which is pure credit created by the loans which they make against various kinds of securities. It is true that when a customer borrows from his bank, he does not leave the proceeds of the loan on deposit or current account; but then it is equally true that he does not, except in the rarest cases, take them away in cash and hoard them; what he does in the ordinary course of business, is to draw a cheque against the loan and pay it to someone from whom he has bought something or to whom he is in some way indebted. His creditor pays the cheque into his bank and draws against it in payment to other parties, and so every loan creates a deposit, and most of the money that modern industry handles consists of cheques drawn against loans by bankers, and so is credit raised on some form of security. The free creation of this credit is one of the most important functions of banking, and very great care must be taken that its legitimate performance is not hampered by any restrictions that are imposed in order to check over-production and over-trading by the banks. When folk talk of reforming the money market, they must remember that they are proposing to regulate the working of a highly efficient machine, the only charge that can be urged against which is the admitted fact that it has performed certain of its functions with so much effect as to interfere with others.

The most important part of the business of the banker, from the point of view of the general community, is the assistance that he gives to legitimate trade; and owing to commercial activity and the high prices of materials, the trade demand on the banks for accommodation has lately been unusually exacting. When credit is created too freely, the speculator is encouraged to compete for it with the trader, and the speculator, especially if he is imbued with the megalomaniac exuberance of the Wall Street operator, is unrestrained by the checks which give the trader pause, and is prepared to pay fancy prices for credit in the hope of earning a gambling profit. Thus in times of speculative activity the speculator shoulders the trader out of the way, and the latter has to pay highly for the funds required for his legitimate business, merely because masses of finance bills are created and discounted at high rates, and blocks of securities are carried over on the

Stock Exchange on terms which stimulate the creation of fresh credits, which, as we have seen, become deposits, and so make the proportion between cash and deposits still more slender. The danger involved by this operation is all the greater when the speculator is a foreigner, and his credits enable him to take gold away from London and so diminish still further the proportion between bankers' cash and liabilities. As we have seen, this autumn the American credits created here by borrowing, in order to finance the very excusable buoyancy of the Wall Street market, just added the last straw to the heap of demands on London's gold store, and necessitated the employment of stringent measures by the Bank of England. Critics of the Bank in the City maintain that these measures need not have been nearly so severe, if they had been initiated earlier, but this is a side path into which we need not be tempted. It is sufficient for our present purpose if the fact has been made clear, that by the over-creation of credit by the outer circle of banks—the 'clearing' banks, as they are generally called by way of distinction—the Bank of England at the centre is exposed to drafts on its gold store to which it would not otherwise be subject.

This over-creation of credit, which arises merely because most of the clearing banks habitually lend what we call money—which nowadays chiefly means the right to draw a cheque—too freely, would, it is contended, be checked very promptly if all bankers carrying on business in the United Kingdom, could be induced to make a monthly statement showing, week by week, their average position in the matter of cash in hand or at the Bank of England, and liabilities on deposit and current accounts; the desirability of this reform is backed by the authority of the President of the Institute of Bankers, and what is still more remarkable, his voice has also decided in favour of legislation to this end. Bankers, like everybody else, are naturally most reluctant to invite anything like Government interference with their business, and we may be very sure that when the President of the Institute asks for a Bill, all arts have been exhausted in vain to compass the desired end without an appeal to the Legislature.

On the other hand, there is little reason to doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be willing to oblige the bankers with a measure more or less on the lines suggested. Mr. Asquith has stated repeatedly that the question of the money market is engaging his earnest attention. It will be remembered that at a bankers' dinner a few months ago he advocated the publication of weekly returns by the banks, thereby echoing a suggestion made by Mr. J. Herbert Tritton during his tenure of the Presidency of the Institute. The Chancellor's advocacy of this reform fell on deaf ears at the moment, but now he is invited by the present President to make a still more drastic one compulsory by law, and insist on not merely weekly

returns, but monthly returns showing weekly averages, obligatory on all bankers.

The question of weekly *v.* monthly returns is a matter of detail, but public opinion in the City on the whole supports the view expressed by the President of the Institute in his argument in favour of the view that the statement should show weekly averages throughout the period covered. Statements of average figures are open to certain objections, but the great point in their favour, in this connection, is the fact that they would practically abolish the system of window-dressing.

It need hardly be said that much more stringent measures have been suggested. Some Hotspurs of reform have advocated the adoption of the American system, by which banks of a certain status are compelled to keep 25 per cent. of their liabilities on deposit in cash, and are liable to inspection by Government for the enforcement of the law. But there is much to be said against hard-and-fast rules of this sort, in matters of banking, and Mr. Spencer Phillips is doubtless right when he contends that enforced publicity is all that is required, and that 'no bank could continue to exist which studiously ignored the necessity of putting itself into a position which the standard of safety demands.'

Moreover, if legislation on the lines that he suggests failed in its object, it would always be possible to take another step and make a certain proportion of cash compulsory. But it cannot be repeated too often that the money market is a most delicate machine, and requires the most delicate handling. The President of the Bankers' Institute thinks that the banks should be compelled to show their average position at stated intervals. This in itself is a very large order according to the views of old-fashioned bankers, and is certainly worth trying before recourse is had to the more stringent measures which can always be applied if it fails in its effect.

There is little need to fear this, however. In fact its effect will probably be so considerable that the banking world and the host of borrowers who have battened on its over-trading propensities ought to be given an ample period in which to make preparations for the new era. If carried out suddenly, the effect of the suggested measure would be the same as if, under present circumstances, all the banks were continually window-dressing at once. Credit would be at famine prices and the Bank of England would be called on to provide it in large amounts, to the detriment of the proportion between its cash and liabilities. It is therefore desirable that at least six months, perhaps a year, should elapse between the passing of the suggested measure and its enforcement. During that time, credit would have time to clip its wings little by little, here a snip and there a snip, to fit the new conditions; and the first effect of the measure would thus be worked out gradually and quietly and without a violent jerk.

At the same time it may fairly be hoped that the ultimate result of the measure, the strengthening of the Bank of England's store of gold, would also be proceeding. If the argument is correct, that the Bank is impeded in its task of maintaining its gold, by the extent to which the clearing banks create credits which enable it to be drawn on, it will follow that as the clearing banks reduce their creations of credit to a volume more commensurate with their holdings of cash, the task of the Bank of England will become easier. The restriction of credit facilities should result in a higher and steadier level of loan rates, and a normally higher and steadier discount market, for the time being. Ultimately, perhaps, market conditions will adjust themselves to the new system, but its first operation could not fail to tend to a higher price for credit, though its actual result may of course be veiled by those of conflicting influences. The higher rates so achieved will have the usual result of assisting the Bank of England to repair and expand the basis of credit, and so the double process will go on, the top-heavy superstructure being reduced by a storey or two, while the foundation is at the same time being strengthened, until the due relation between structure and foundation is at last secured. Some inconvenience may be caused to borrowers until they have adjusted their desires to the narrower possibilities of credit; but in the long run they also will probably be benefited, since if the price of credit is higher than it would otherwise have been, it ought to tend to be steadier; and the trader, the legitimate user of credit, will be better off with a money market that is steady at a slightly higher point on the average than with one which goes up and down like a switchback.

It will be necessary, however, to provide, as far as possible, that the struggle which may result from the narrowing of credit does not tend to the discomfiture of the trader by his speculating rival; but a little care and tactful management on the part of bankers should be able to secure this end. The banker knows that the trader is his best and most constant customer, and may be trusted to see that, if credit facilities have to be curtailed, the genuine trader shall be the last to suffer, if, indeed, he has to suffer at all.

This simple reform, then, may do much and at little expense, in the long run. It does not at all follow that bank shareholders will suffer, for it can be argued very plausibly that by over-trading in credit bankers have spoilt their own market; in future they will lend rather less and at higher and steadier rates. The genuine trader, as has been said, may have to pay rather more for his credit at first, but the comparative steadiness of its price which should be achieved under the new system will enable him to make arrangements with more confidence, an element of uncertainty having been eliminated or reduced. The foreign raiders of London's gold store will find a credit machine less conveniently adapted for their operations, and the

Bank of England's task in increasing the stock of metal in its vaults will be *pro tanto* facilitated. The Bank has already shown every willingness to carry out its task, and may be trusted to take full advantage of its improved opportunities.

There is no need now to enter into the many suggestions that have been made for the further modification of our monetary system, as for instance that the clearing banks should themselves establish larger reserves in their own vaults. They could only do so by taking gold out of the Bank of England, or preventing it acquiring imported gold as it came to our shores; so that they would strengthen themselves at its expense, and what we gained on the swings we should lose on the roundabouts. But it may be as well to point out that the Bank of England itself would not be a loser by holding more gold. It is often contended, or assumed as a matter of course, that every sovereign or ounce of gold held by the Bank is an act of self-sacrifice on its part, and that if it were to hold as a general average some five or ten millions more than it does, its shareholders would have to be mulcted of part of their dividends. This is not so. The Bank is in the happy position of being able to buy gold or securities and to pay for them, merely by giving the seller a credit in its books. If a million sovereigns were taken to it to-morrow, the only result would be a book entry—on one side 1,000,000*l.* gold coin, on the other 1,000,000*l.* on someone's account. The someone would probably draw on his account, but his draft would work its way round through the clearing house and come back to the Bank like a homing pigeon. In fact the Bank would be richer by the process because, its gold being increased, its proportion between cash and liabilities would be improved and it would be enabled, if it chose, to increase its holding of securities, and so its dividend-earning power.

It must not be expected or supposed that the reform that is now believed to be on the anvil is going to effect a ready-made financial millennium and leave nothing more to be done. But it may fairly be hoped that it will cut away the root of one of the most important evils that have been at the bottom of all that has caused discomfort and disquietude in the City. When it has been carried out there are plenty of other items to be considered. The finance and other arrangements of the Post Office Savings Bank are a matter on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is likely to hear more. At present they provide a most useful *tu quoque* to over-trading bankers when they are hauled over the coals for the inefficiency of their cash reserves; they can at any rate thank Providence that they are not as that publican, the Government, which holds 200 millions of deposits with no cash reserve at all. The Bank of England, of course, is used to criticism in the City, and is likely to remain so; but it is by no means deaf to it, and has already done much, by closer co-operation with other wheels in the monetary machine, and an attitude of less Olym-

pian aloofness, to come into closer touch with the sentiment of Lombard Street and to act more promptly than it did. Further progress along these lines will doubtless be effected. The Treasury, again, may expect to have claims presented by the City for clearer accounts than those given by the weekly statements now published, which are efficient in darkening counsel. The City is often perturbed by the financial measures of the Government, and surely has a right to be shown, with reasonable clearness, what Government finance is about. Another interesting suggestion made by Mr. Spencer Phillips in the Presidential address already referred to, was to the effect that the Bank of England's weekly return should show the amount of the bankers' balances separately from the rest of the 'other deposits.' And again, a new departure that is often advocated points to the desirability of the English banks taking a more active part in exchange operations, and holding foreign bills with a view to influencing foreign exchanges when it is necessary to do so.'

All these things might be discussed at length, but they are not the subject of the present inquiry. It cannot be too emphatically insisted on that the City does not need, and still less wants, to be turned inside out and upside down by well-meant activity on the part of the Legislature. That something should be done is agreed, and Mr. Spencer Phillips has given Mr. Asquith a lead, such as no Chancellor has ever received from the City. The way is thus made ready for a short businesslike Act, and the amount of discussion that has already raged round the matter surely makes it wholly unnecessary that a fresh flood of eloquence and longwindedness should be let loose by the institution of any sort of inquiry. Half an hour's conversation with a few representative bankers should settle the matter.

Finally, it must be remembered that gold can only be got, like any other commodity, by paying for it. If we want to keep more of the gold that we receive from our gold mines abroad, we can only do so by buying less of other things or services from foreign nations, or by selling more things or services to them. The trade figures have shown that we have already done something in this direction, and if the trade balance is allowed to work its effect, uncomplicated by kite-flying operations by foreign gamblers in the London money market, and by sportive ebullitions on the part of Nature, like the San Francisco earthquake, which gave the United States power to draw many millions from the British fire offices, there is every reason to hope that the gold reserve question will be satisfactorily settled, given time and perseverance.

HARTLEY WITHERS.

THE INFLUENCE OF CATULLUS

I AM sometimes tempted to think, no matter upon what occasions, that English is a dead language. Such paradox never assails one in the case of Greek and Latin. 'Wonderful poet Mr. Southey,' said an enthusiast to Richard Porson. 'Yes indeed,' was the reply. 'His verses will be read when Homer and Virgil are forgotten.' Such conditional immortality might be predicted of more than one poetaster now flourishing, as the biographical dictionaries say, among ourselves. 'To be read when Catullus is forgotten' might safely be inscribed on many a volume which is not prose because the lines are of uneven length, and it would be a fitting form of eternal farewell. For seven hundred years Catullus, the 'tenderest of Roman poets,' disappeared from the world. Then, by an accident or a miracle, one mutilated manuscript was found at his native town, Verona, surely the loveliest of all Italian cities, and from that time, the beginning of the fourteenth century, his poems have been the secure possession of mankind. An ingenious, but not very instructive, parallel has been drawn between Catullus and Burns. The resemblance, if there be one, is of course purely fortuitous, and means little more than the acknowledged fact that they are two of the greatest lyric poets in all literature, ancient or modern. From the social and material point of view Byron was more like Catullus. The Scottish peasant who broke his birth's invidious bar had little besides poetic genius and human sentiment in common with the voluptuous aristocrat and man of fashion who wasted his substance in riotous living while the old Roman Republic was crumbling beneath the feet of Cicero and his friends. Carlyle said, with as much truth as beauty, that Burns's songs were jets of pure feeling, springing up from the universal depths of things. Burns went deeper, and therefore he rose higher, than Byron or even Shelley. Imperfect as his practice may have been, he was not in theory irreligious. His scorching satire, in which Catullus is immeasurably his inferior, was directed against orthodox bigotry and sanctimonious hypocrisy. The moderates in the Church of Scotland, even ministers, were delighted with *Holy Willie's Prayer*. Not a hundred years ago a divinity student at Edinburgh, being asked who introduced Christianity into Scotland, answered without hesita-

tion 'Robert Burns.' To Catullus religion meant merely a vain scruple, or such superstitious cruelty as moved the indignation of Lucretius when he described the sacrifice of Iphigenia. On the other hand the passion of Burns is cold beside the passion of Catullus, and he wrote much of his best verse in a provincial dialect, whereas Catullus knew Greek literature by heart, and is called learned even by Ovid, whose own learning was pedantic. The name of Catullus is linked for ever with the name of Lesbia. Who thinks of Burns in connection with Anna? Those exquisite verses which Froude so strangely misquotes:

> Had we never loved so kindly,
> Had we never loved so blindly,
> Never met, or never parted,
> We had'na now been broken hearted:

are perhaps the only lines written in Ayrshire which might have been written in Venetia.

There were no 'unco guid' to persecute Catullus. The society in which he lived, though it contained Cicero, was almost as shameless as it afterwards became in the worst days of the Empire. It is dangerous, even in our own enlightened period, to judge people by their language. The *Fescennina locutio*, the Saturnalian licence of speech, to which Catullus himself refers, would now be neither written nor printed, and it startles us even in Latin poetry, 'Pagan, I regret to say,' as Mr. Pecksniff remarked of the Sirens. Yet the most impure images of Catullus were surpassed by Swift, who was a dean, and wanted to be a bishop. All this dross can be melted away without impairing or disturbing the pure gold which it covers. Catullus's imitator Martial, who copied him at his best and at his worst, was coldly and systematically indecent. Catullus put in passages like actors' gag, such as sometimes disfigure even Shakespeare, a tribute to custom rather than a sign of personal corruption. He was undoubtedly passion's slave. His bondage to Clodia of the blazing eyes, the fine lady to whose beauty and accomplishments even Cicero paid a reluctant homage, extorted from him the most pathetic prayer for deliverance that has come from a lover's lips or pen. But at the same time he was the warmest, the most faithful of friends, and his lamentations for the death of his brother are enshrined in poems that cannot die. His scurrilous attacks upon Cæsar are not more revolting than Swift's rhymed libel upon Salamander Cutts; and Cæsar was alive, while Cutts was dead. Catullus wanted no kind of courage, and he hated the notion of the military dictatorship which he did not live to see. When he finally turned upon Clodia in a savage indignation which still glows with heat, he had far more cause than Pope could claim for his equally scandalous lines on Lady Mary Wortley. Catullus at least did not affect the vices he had no opportunity of committing. It took him a long time to realise that for the sister of Clodius and the

wife of Metellus, 'about the greatest lady in the world,' as a modern professor calls her, compared by her friends with Venus, and by her enemies with Juno, one man was literally as good as another. Manon Lescaut was a saint to the woman whom Catullus loved more than himself and all his house, with as much tenderness as passion.

Nobody is quite so modern as the ancients. Catullus delighted in all the social gaiety of Rome without ever forgetting his old fellow citizens of Verona, their quarrels and pleasures, and interests and pursuits. He loved yachting, and wrote faultless iambics about his yacht. His villa at 'Olive-silvery Sirmio' inspired one of Tennyson's most beautiful poems. His travels in Asia gave him the keenest enjoyment, and yet he longed to be at home again, sleeping quietly in his own bed. Dissipation did not interfere with his study of Greek, and there is no reason to suppose that he was comparatively vicious. Indeed he boasted that his life was purer than his writings, as it may very well have been. It was a short life, hardly longer than Shelley's, and even richer in the highest order of verse. How many of his poems were original we cannot accurately know. Two of them are avowedly translated from the Greek, the *Hair of Berenice* and the famous rendering of Sappho to which Mr. Swinburne attributes unsurpassable merit. Although it certainly has not the uninteresting merit of fidelity, it is so good a poem that it might have been written independently of Sappho, and it does not, as hers does, confuse the genders. The *Hair of Berenice* is a Latin version of an elegy by Callimachus on the lock which the Queen of Egypt vowed to the gods on condition that her husband Ptolemy Euergetes came back safe from Syria, which he was invading. This lock was fancifully identified with a group of stars, and upon that somewhat frigid conceit Callimachus founded his ode. Only a passion for Greek literature, almost amounting to a craze, can explain why Catullus should have wasted his time in reproducing the work of a writer so much inferior to himself. Until we come to the great satirist of the silver age, we hardly find a Roman poet who did not copy Greek models. Plautus and Terence did it unblushingly. Horace and Virgil boasted of it. One mighty contemporary of Catullus made himself the mouthpiece of Epicurus through the instruments of Homer and Empedocles. Not to know Greek in the time of Catullus was worse and more illiterate than not to know French now. Horace, who only once mentions Catullus, and that with a sneer, advised young men to study Greek models, night and day, which was exactly what Catullus had done, without the slightest harm to his original powers.

The first poet to feel the influence of Catullus was his own contemporary Lucretius, whose commanding and creative mind was as much scientific as poetical. Although he made himself the exponent of Epicurean philosophy, a high and even ascetic creed vulgarised

and degraded by the false ideas which the name of epicure now suggests, Lucretius set himself to study what he denounced, especially the phænomena of love. About his life, though it was spent in the full blaze of an epoch not less famous than the Augustan age which succeeded it, we know nothing at all. A single sentence in the chronicle of St. Jerome, written several centuries later, tells us that he was driven mad by a philtre, that he wrote several books during the intervals of his madness, that Cicero corrected them, and that the author took his own life at the age of forty-three. It is incredible that the stately poem, not poems, on the Nature of Things was a fitful episode in recurrent lunacy. Cicero in his voluminous correspondence never once says that he had anything to do with it, and the single passage in which he mentions Lucretius is so hopelessly corrupt that we cannot tell whether he attributes to him art without genius or genius without art. But the splendid lines where Lucretius describes the results of an irregular life might well be a moral on the published verses of Catullus, and it is difficult to suppose that he had not seen them. The most probable inference is that Lucretius used Catullus as Pascal used Montaigne, to prove how fading was the worldling's treasure, all his boasted pomp and show. Tennyson's poem, the most Lucretian thing in English, is founded on Jerome's gossip, and may almost be held to justify it. But it is an idle tale. Although the love-potion administered by the dissatisfied wife may be a tempting fancy, it is pure conjecture that Lucretius had a wife, and mental derangement is as incongruous with the *De Rerum Natura* as with *In Memoriam* or the *Origin of Species*. We can much more easily imagine Lucretius divided between admiration of Catullus's genius and contempt for his amours.

The real life of Catullus was Clodia. No one who has read Alphonse Daudet's *Sapho* can forget how light she seemed when the young man began to carry her upstairs, and how heavy she became before he reached the top. So it was with Catullus and Clodia. As Professor Mackail says in his wonderfully brilliant *Manual of Latin Literature*, 'that intolerable pride which was the proverbial curse of the Claudian house took in her the form of a flagrant disregard of all conventions.' She belonged to a type which by general consent is assumed to have died out of civilised Christendom. She was a law to herself. So far as she recognised any difference between right and wrong, whatever she did was right. For no human being was entitled to criticise her, and that there was any superhuman being she did not believe. Her dazzling beauty, her keen and cultivated intellect, her haughty self-reliance, and her complete absence of moral scruple, made as dangerous a combination of positive and negative qualities as a young man with warm feelings could well encounter in this world of sin. When Catullus met her he was twenty-five, and unmarried. She was a married woman of thirty-two. *Cætera quis nescit?*—as Ovid says. Little did

she think that connection with Catullus meant literary immortality, or that she would inspire verses destined to be the common heritage of mankind for centuries after the Claudian and Valerian families had mingled in the dust with commoner clay. Even her pet sparrow would be a household word if she could be associated with any kind of household, and learned commentators have quarrelled over the question, which divided Browning from De Quincey, whether it was a real sparrow or not.

The poems of Catullus are arranged in so wild and maddening a disorder that it almost passes the wit of man and the art of chronology to disentangle them. We may, however, take for granted that there are no lines addressed to Clodia of earlier date than the exquisite *Vivamus atque amemus*, 'let us live and love.' Three verses of this perfect little idyll have the implacable beauty and the imperishable grace of a Greek statue.

> Soles occidere et redire possunt:
> Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,
> Nox est perpetua una dormienda.

I dare not attempt to translate them. They cannot really be translated. The thought, so far as it be not common to the human race, is taken from the greater but more ambitious lines of Moschus, which Wordsworth has adapted and Christianised in the *Afterthought* to his *Sonnets on the Duddon*. Ben Jonson comes as near Catullus as is lawful for one born on the wrong side of the Alps, and at least he gives the sense, in

> Suns that set may rise again,
> But if once we lose this light,
> 'Tis with us perpetual night.

I don't want to be hypercritical. But where is *brevis* in Jonson, and where is *dormienda*? On the other hand, the last line of the Latin is not quite on a level with the long roll of Moschus's hexameter:

> εὕδομες εἰ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.

A great French poet of the Renaissance, Pierre de Ronsard, on whom Mr. George Wyndham lately published a charming essay, has imitated this first of Catullus's erotic odes in some rather too elegant verses:

> La lune est coutumière
> Renaître tous les mois;
> Mais, quand notre lumière
> Sera morte une fois,
> Longtemps sans réveiller
> Nous faudra sommeiller.

Tandis que vivons ores,
Un baiser donne-moi;
Donne m'en mille encores;
Amour n'a point de loi;
A sa grand' déité,
Convient l'infinité.

A very pretty poem, but not Catullus. It is quite true, as Miss Edith Sichel observes in her account of Ronsard, that his master Dorat 'steeped him in the knowledge of the classics.' But, if 'Herman's a German,' Ronsard was a Frenchman, and only a Frenchman would have rendered *perpetua* by *longtemps*, eternity by a long time, the one thing it certainly is not. There is nothing in Ronsard about indifference to scandal, and the remarks of older but not wiser people. 'Clodia,' indeed, as Mr. Mackail drily remarks, 'soon showed that the advice not to care for the opinion of the world was in her case infinitely superfluous.' But Catullus's study of Clodia had only just begun. He could write of nothing but kisses numerous as the sand, or as the stars, not so very numerous by the way, which look down on the stolen meetings of lovers, in his own flawless Latin :

Furtivos hominum vident amores.

Of the hendecasyllabic, or Phalæcian line, reproduced by Tennyson in

Irresponsible, indolent reviewers,

there could be no more perfect example.

The names of Acme and Septimius are embalmed in the most perfect of all Italian love-songs. Compared with

At Acme leviter caput reflectens,
Et dulcis pueri ebrios ocellos
Illo purpureo ore saviata

or with

Unam Septimius misellus Acmen
Mavult quam Syrias Britanniasque :
Uno in Septimio fidelis Acme
Facit delicias libidinesque

the dialogue of Horace and Lydia, so happily paraphrased by Matthew Prior, is cold and tame indeed. It is not for want of literary skill, in which no man has excelled him, that the imperial poet falls short of the republican. It is because Horace was a mere sensualist, and Catullus had a heart. He says himself that he loved Lesbia, who was Clodia, with tenderness as well as with passion, and that is one reason why Martial, though he spent his life in imitating Catullus, never came within a thousand miles of him. Even when he turned upon Clodia in the awful lines contrasting his former love with her present degradation, lines which cling to her name like the shirt of

Nessus, it is the outraged lover who speaks, not the complacent, self-conscious artist. Time has no power over the eloquence of Nature, where the language is part of the sentiment, not so much the garment as the skin. Even Burns, true poet that he was, cannot move men as Catullus can. Turn from Acme to Anna :

The Kirk and State may join, and tell
To do such things I mauna:
The Kirk and State may go to hell,
And I'll gae to my Anna.
She is the sunshine o' my ee,
To live but her I canna;
Had I on earth but wishes three,
The first should be my Anna.

The second and third verses are not wanting in boldness, but after all the Kirk is there, and no anathema can get rid of it. What Catullus would have said to the Kirk we can but dimly surmise. Probably he would have valued it at the lowest coin, as he valued the *rumores senum severiorum*. Burns could curse it, and he did. Ignore it he could not. When he wrote of 'bonie Lesley,' he was even less like Catullus.

O saw ye bonie Lesley
As she gaed o'er the border?
She's gane, like Alexander,
To spread her conquests farther.

That was exactly what Catullus wished Clodia not to do, and precisely what she did. There were no borders for the great Claudian house. Such things were not made for people of Clodia's quality. Catullus was no more than an incident of her triumphant career through the crowd of admirers with whose spoils she decorated her statue of Venus. She was his soul, and his inspiration. When first he found that she was not for him alone, that like the sun whose beams most glorious are she rejected no beholder, his remonstrances were gentle enough. After all he was not that 'mule' her husband.

At that time he wrote the words, beautifully if rather liberally translated by Sir Theodore Martin :

I loved you then with love beyond
The transient flush of passion wild;
Ay, with a tenderness as fond
As binds the parent to the child.

When at last the end came, as it had to come, for Clodia was but a refined and erudite animal, he poured out his soul in a passionate despairing confession which must somehow be Englished, because it is the man.

If [he says] one can take any pleasure in remembering his deeds of kindness, in reflecting that he has performed his duty, and has neither broken the sanctity

of trust nor abused the authority of the gods to deceive mankind, there remain in store for you, Catullus, in a long life many joys to be culled from this unrequited affection. For whatsoever good a man could bestow on a fellow creature by word or deed, that you have said and done. Now that it has all perished in the faithless soul to which it was committed, why should you torment yourself further? Why not fortify your mind and tear yourself away from dwelling on the thing and cease from a wretchedness which is against the divine will? It is hard to lay aside in a moment the love of years. It is hard, but you must compass it in some way. This is your one salvation; this victory you must win; this you must accomplish, whether it be possible or whether it be not. O ye gods, if pity is yours, if you have ever brought men help at the last even in the article of death, look upon poor me, and if I have led an honest life, deliver me from this noisome pestilence which, creeping like a lethargy through my innermost frame, has driven all enjoyment from my heart. I do not ask now that she should love me in return, or that she should even wish to be chaste, for that is impossible. What I desire is my own health and the cure of this foul disease. Grant me this, O gods, in return for my righteous dealing.

Although Catullus's expectation of a long life was not destined to be fulfilled, though his allotted span was shorter than Byron's, and hardly longer than Shelley's, Clodia did not absorb the whole of it. He is the poet of friendship as well as love, and his mode of saluting his friends has an Italian fervour about it which would not be considered excessive in Italy to-day. Perhaps the best example is the charming little ode to Veranius on his return from Spain, as fresh and boyish an outburst of simple, hearty affection as the Latin language contains. It contrasts well with the stately eulogy of the lines addressed to Cicero, which may have been thought an exaggeration at the time, but have now been for centuries the common opinion of the world. Catullus was a personal and hereditary friend of Julius Cæsar. Yet he attacks Cæsar in language which can only be called scurrilous, and exhausts hyperbole in praise of Cicero. Why? Conjecture, not history, suggests that the great orator had appeared for Catullus in some lawsuit, long since forgotten. We know for certain that aristocratic republicans, like the poet, regarded Cicero, though a self-made man, as a pillar of the old Republic, and Cæsar as already aiming at a tyranny, as himself a destructive force. The republicanism of Catullus, which would in our day be called Constitutional Conservatism of an exclusive type, accounts for the oblivion into which, together with Cicero and Lucretius, he sank during the Augustan age. The literary splendour of that period, even the names of Virgil and Horace, cannot hide its abject servility. There are even those who think that if the whole work of Livy had perished with its second decade, real history, as distinct from picturesque narrative, would not have been much the loser. But to ignore Catullus is easier than to forget him. Horace himself, a courtier if ever there was one, and usually content with Greek objects when he copied, has closely imitated the address of Catullus to his travelling companions Furius and Aurelius, though not the terrible message

to Clodia with which that poem concludes. We shall never understand Catullus unless we bear in mind that, writing for contemporary Romans who knew all about him, he contrasts the occasional licence of his verse with the habitual decorum of his life. A great poet may be credited with imagination, and we need not suppose that the extremely reprehensible note to Ipsithilla was sent to a real person. As regards Clodia, Catullus undoubtedly considered himself an injured innocent, and his devoted constancy to another man's wife was pure virtue in his eyes. It would be wholly preposterous to judge him by any Christian principle or idea. His *pietas* was not piety but duty, the moral obligation of a Roman citizen, together with the attachments of the family and the home. When Tennyson, after visiting Sirmione, wrote his haunting verses about Catullus, it was 'the *ave atque vale* of the poet's hopeless woe' that appealed most strongly to his mind. Catullus himself recurs to his brother's death again and again as a sorrow which never left him, making him hate the Troad, where his brother died. He had the note of pathos as clearly as the note of passion. He was trying to console a friend for the loss of a wife when he wrote that unequalled couplet:

> Quæ desiderio veteres revocamus amores,
> Atque olim amissas flemus amicitias.

Tennyson never paid Catullus a higher tribute, not even in his own verses, than when he said that these two lines reminded him of a passage in one of Shakespeare's sonnets:

> Then could I drown an eye unused to flow
> For precious friends hid in death's dateless night:
> And weep afresh for long since cancelled woe,
> And moan the expense of many a vanished sight.

Mr. Robinson Ellis, the Professor of Latin at Oxford, whose profound erudition it would be an impertinence to praise, has most aptly compared the fragment in which Catullus explains that he could neither love Clodia nor hate her, meaning that he could not help doing both, with the conclusion of another sonnet:

> So true a fool is love that in your will,
> Though you do anything, he thinks no ill.

If I might add a humble parallel of my own, it would concern the gratitude of Catullus to the friend who helped him in his first stolen meetings with Clodia:

> Ne vestrum scabra tangat rubigine nomen
> Hæc atque illa dies atque alia atque alia.

How suggestive, despite the Latin poet's inferiority, of:

> So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
> So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

The English reader who wants to understand how Catullus really thought and wrote cannot find a better guide than the delicate and faithful translation in the best English prose by Mr. Warre-Cornish, the Vice-Provost of Eton. Among poetical versions Sir Theodore Martin's is the most successful, and a few lines from his rendering of the *Peleus and Thetis* will show Catullus as a poet of description better than anything else that I know. The subject is Ariadne:

> Down dropped the fillet from her golden hair,
> Dropped the light vest that veiled her bosom fair.
> The filmy cincture dropped, that strove to bind
> Her orbèd breasts, which would not be confined:
> And as they fell around her feet of snow
> The salt waves caught and flung them to and fro.

Even Mr. Meredith has hardly painted such a picture in words. Greek literature itself, to which Catullus owed everything except his genius, might be searched in vain for a happier touch. The faults of Catullus were the faults of youth, and of the age he lived in. His models were Hellenic. His eloquence and imagination, his ardour and sincerity, his simplicity and depth, were his own. Through them he has survived all that was destructible in Paganism, and all that was mortal in Rome. They have made him, they make him still, a refuge from all weary and dreary things, from human and inhuman boredom, from the chronic dulness of trivial chatter, and from the poetry of the day.

HERBERT PAUL.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY *cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER



No. CCCLX—February 1907

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

Twenty-five years ago this Review was instrumental in helping to stop a scheme for destroying the insularity of England by means of a railway to be made under the Channel, and thereby joining the soil of Great Britain to the soil of the Continent.

It was a scheme of private speculators and company-promoters, and, as soon as its character was realised by the public, it was promptly repudiated and dismissed by the common sense of the country.

A Public Protest which appeared in these pages was signed by all sorts and conditions of men, and backed by almost the whole Press. It ran thus :[1]

> The undersigned—having had their attention called to certain proposals made by commercial companies for joining England to the Continent of Europe by a Railroad under the Channel, and feeling convinced that (notwithstanding any precautions against risk suggested by the projectors)

[1] See page 1 of Supplement.

such a Railroad would involve this country in military dangers and liabilities from which, as an island, it has hitherto been happily free—hereby record their emphatic protest against the sanction or execution of any such work.

Attention was called in this and other ways to the egregious nature of the proposal and its almost incredible folly, and a chorus of condemnation arose.

'Do your people understand?' said Count Münster, the German Ambassador here. 'Do your people understand? Do they not see that they might one day, however unwillingly, be drawn into some Continental complication, and that in the uncertain fortune of war England might for the time be on the losing side? While she remains an island she would in the end certainly right herself by means of her navy, but if by any chance she were defeated after such a tunnel were made, the first condition of peace exacted by a victorious enemy would be the surrender in perpetuity of the entrance to it, and the consequent loss of your independent existence.'

'What would not Germany give for twenty miles of water between her and France!' said the Empress Frederick, then the Crown Princess, to the present writer.

The public opinion evoked was conclusive and a death-blow to the insane project, which was supposed to be shelved and forgotten, at any rate until England should have forgotten the immunities she derives from her island fortress.

But company-promoters and speculators, like the poor, are always with us and always ready to renew their attacks upon public credulity. It has been suggested that it might therefore be well to remind readers at the present time of the careful and exhaustive way in which the matter was considered in the last generation, and to reproduce the record of what passed in 1882 for easy and convenient reference. It is accordingly reprinted here, and forms a Supplement to this number.

Public opinion has altered so little since then that it is still faithfully reflected by this record. What changes in it have taken place tend to intensify the objections of common sense to the project which Baron d'Erlanger and his friends now again urge upon us. There is, for instance, a growing desire and determination to diminish the burden of taxation for military purposes so far as is compatible with national security; and the present Government especially acknowledges a 'mandate' to that effect. Yet at a time when every effort is being made to limit our defensive forces, both naval and military, to a point which many consider too risky, these promoters have the assurance to ask for a serious and quite voluntary

increase in them. Nobody—not even the promoters themselves and their sympathisers—denies that elaborate and costly and permanent precautions (which might or might not be practically effective when the critical moment arrived) must be taken to close up or destroy, upon occasion, the hole which the promoters would bore through our hitherto inviolate frontier. To avoid public panics alone and their ruinous expenditures, such precautions would be indispensable. That admission is fatal to the argument that there is no risk in the scheme.

And why should one iota of national risk be incurred for it?

To un-island England and join her soil to the soil of the Continent while Europe is seething with unrest and complexities and perplexities, and to do this at the invitation of private company-promoters for their own (problematical) profit, sounds like the plot of a comic opera. Fortunately, it will no more commend itself to British common sense than it did twenty-five years ago.

Victor Hugo once said to me in Paris, 'I shall not live to see, but you will live to see the United States of Europe'; to which my rejoinder was, 'Then I shall live to be a very old man!'

When that day dawns England may possibly be willing to modify her entire reliance upon her Sea-Frontier and adopt conscription, but till then she will neither undermine it herself nor suffer it to be undermined by others.

JAMES KNOWLES (*Editor*).

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

II

THE advocates of the Channel Tunnel, it appears, complain that no statement has been put forward, by those who object to it, of the definite grounds of their protest or of the dangers which they see in its construction. That means, I take it, that they have not read those very definite statements which have been put forward; but as it is very easy to re-state the case I propose now to do so. Nearly a quarter of a century ago the reasons given were sufficiently definite to cause that strong expression of national feeling against the Tunnel which Sir James Knowles is now issuing as a supplement herewith. All that has happened, since that vigorous denunciation of the scheme was published, has tended to show that the danger is greater even than we then had reason to suppose. Two wars have taken place since the question last became urgent. One of them has shown the dangers of trusting to the perpetual vigilance of the defenders of a vital point; the other the impossibility of taking precautions in the moment of danger. When the Russo-Japanese war broke out the Russian fleet at Port Arthur was far less vital to the safety of Russia than our end of the Channel Tunnel must always be for us; yet, when Admiral Togo, on the night of the 8th to 9th of February, 1904, attacked the Russian fleet and reduced it to a condition of impotence which from that hour made it impossible for it to contest the command of the seas with Japan, so little did anyone in Port Arthur expect Japanese attack that the great bulk of the officers both of navy and army were the invited guests of one of the principal officers of the garrison, and were carousing gaily when the sounds from the harbour burst upon their ears. Even more significant was the history of our late Boer war. During all the time when Kruger and Steyn were preparing their armaments, it was, as is duly recorded in the official history, impossible for our Government to take those steps which were necessary to remove the local military weakness of our troops, on which the Boer leaders were counting to enable them to gain their ends, because, well as the facts were known to them, the nation did not know them, and every attempt to warn

the people at large of the coming danger tended to leave the impression that it was designed to bring on war. That always has been so throughout the whole course of our history. Always, long before our present Constitution came into being, our rulers have felt it necessary to have the whole nation behind them before they ventured upon war, and have dreaded lest they should be supposed to be the guilty parties who bring it on. It is old chroniclers who, on that account, always speak of England as 'the unready.'

Hitherto our dominant fleets have given us time for preparation, at least for home defence. When once the Channel Tunnel is made, the safety of England will depend, not upon anything that our fleets can do, but upon the unceasing vigilance and adequate power of those who protect the English end of the Tunnel. That is a strain which has never yet been put upon any English troops whatever. One can only therefore judge of the possibility of trusting to its being continuous throughout all time by the experiences of others. Now war has often begun by the sudden surprise of fortresses incalculably less important than this would be to us. Those who say that a thousand men firing down the Channel Tunnel with modern quick-firing rifles would be adequate to stop any numbers coming out of the narrow opening, assume conditions which could not in fact prevail. If the thousand men were there, if they had an open space in front of them to fire down into the column emerging from the Tunnel, the statement would probably be true. But even if the thousand men were actually there at the right moment, the confusion of a great railway station, the movements to and fro of trains, would produce conditions very different from those that are required for the efficient employment of troops. Therefore in none of the schemes which have been put forward by any of those soldiers who have carefully considered the subject has any such proposal really been made. Sir Archibald Alison's Committee, which was appointed to devise the best schemes which could be arranged for the protection of the English end of the Tunnel, recommended a regular fortress as essential for safety. Now, in all the suggestions that are made by those who now advocate the scheme this idea of an independent fortress is dropped. Our safety is, according to them, to depend on the defences which now exist at Dover, the Western heights, and Dover Castle. These are not a fortress in the Continental sense of the term at all. A first-class fortress like Metz requires for its protection 30,000 men. Sir Archibald Alison modestly asked for 8,000 men. The present advocates ask for no increase to the garrison. Yet it is not on the safety of such a fortress as Metz that Germany depends for her security. She depends instead upon the fact that the whole of her virile population is trained to war, and that none escape the claims of the State except those unfortunate people who have some serious physical defect.

Hitherto we have lived in England in a condition of peace, which is quite unknown to the Continent. Abroad every detail of daily life is regulated by authority, so far as it may be necessary for purposes of national security. Everyone who travels at all on the Continent is aware of the difference in this respect between English and Continental methods. It is not merely a question of passports, but of the careful precautions that no one shall live in a given town without all his circumstances being duly reported to the police. In England, on the other hand, the orders to our sentries are that if anyone attempts to break their post they are by no means to interfere with the intruder, but immediately to call a policeman. Unless our sentries are to have this condition of things removed and to shoot at sight, as they would do in Germany, anyone who did not satisfy them as to what his purpose was, no English defences can ever be safe, according to the standard of German or French regulations. Now these regulations are not made because Frenchmen or Germans like better than Englishmen to live under such constraining chains. It is simply because the whole experience of war, which has been brought home to them by the bitter history of the past, has taught them that in no other way can a nation dependent on land defences be secure. It has been more often than not at the beginning of a war that surprises such as those of Port Arthur have been triumphant. The notion that we, living now at peace with our neighbours, are bound to receive from them long notice of their intention to strike a deadly blow, is one for which history affords no justification whatever. Wheresoever it has been possible, the principle enunciated by the Russian diplomatist, Baron Brunnow, in 1840 that 'the blow must first be struck before it is announced,' has been unsparingly applied, applied by us quite as freely as by any other nation, but applied also by every nation in Europe. In the case of the Russo-Japanese war, long negotiations had in fact preceded Admiral Togo's stroke; but no one in Russian army or navy recognised that the moment had come, because the Japanese ambassador had left St. Petersburg, for changing peace for war, easy indifference for vigilance.

Supposing our end of the Tunnel to be in the hands of a foreign Power, Mr. Hiram Maxim says that there are 30,000,000 of people in England and that it is absurd to suppose that they would not be able to defeat troops who have come through the Tunnel. If every one of the men, women, and children whom Mr. Hiram Maxim counts in his estimate, unarmed, unorganised, unaccustomed to the crash of shell and bullets as they are, is ready to expose him or herself to meet the well-trained troops of a foreign Power, the army of which numbers 4,000,000 at the least, it might be possible to begin to discuss the question with him. I, being one of those 'unthinking persons' whom he contemptuously sweeps away, am afraid that he will not find it easy to persuade many of the 30,000,000 men, women, and children that it would be a pleasant

experience. As long as the advocates of the Channel Tunnel put forward as their best arguments such pleas as these, I have great hopes that they will not succeed in persuading the English people to consent to their schemes.

For those who have never realised the supreme position of advantage which we at present enjoy, it may be worth while to re-state it. Hitherto, alone of all European Powers, Great Britain has avoided the strain of liability to universal personal service. Yet she governs the largest and most scattered Empire in the world; her commerce is vaster than that of any other country. Despite the disproportion between the enormous population and the vast area of territory which she has to defend, and the trifling strain that is put upon her home population in defending it, she is able to borrow money at a cheaper rate than any other nation can, because her security is greater than any other. How and why is this? It is because she has been an island; because she has always had at her command powerful fleets which have made actual invasion impossible, at all events without ample notice. When once the Channel Tunnel is made, the defence of the kingdom passes over from our supreme navy to our wholly inadequate army. The further advantage which our fleets have always given us, that, even if a force landed on our shores, it could not long maintain itself there, will be gone.

Success in military operations has always depended mainly on two things: on surprise, and on having safe communications oneself while one can strike those of an enemy. In all Lord Roberts's and Lord Wolseley's most successful efforts, surprise was the element they enlisted in their favour. So it has been also with all the great leaders of war. Lord Roberts, when he attacked the Peiwar Kotal, marched his troops up to a certain point, without informing any single person of his plans; he then exactly reversed the front towards which they were directed in order that the attack might be delivered where no one expected it. During the Boer war his relief of Kimberley and his capture of Kronje depended entirely on his having deceived the Boer leaders, partly by the issue of fictitious orders, partly by doing the exact opposite of what he had reason to know that they expected, and partly by making movements of a kind that left them in doubt as to what he intended to do. The transfer of the army from the Orange River to the Riet was one of the most successful surprises of war. Lord Wolseley began the Ashanti war by a brilliant surprise, due to the spreading of false rumours as to his intentions. In the war against Arabi which gave us Egypt, the transfer of the army from Alexandria through the Suez Canal to Ismailia was carried out, not only without Arabi's knowledge at the time, but it was so completely concealed from the enemy that it was not till afterwards, when he was a prisoner in Ceylon, that the Egyptian chieftain was aware that it had taken place.

Such incidents have been the common features of all war. Yet when Lord Wolseley, who had shown himself a past-master of the art of surprise, explained to the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons the ease with which Dover could be surprised, his words seemed to them like idle tales and they believed them not. That is the disadvantage under which every soldier lies in endeavouring to lay before his countrymen the real dangers which he foresees in the construction of this communication with the Continent. He does not adequately put himself in their place. What seems to him easy seems to them difficult. As Lord Randolph Churchill happily said on one occasion, 'It is very easy to take a debating advantage of any soldier.' Whether the Channel Tunnel is constructed or not depends not at all upon the judgment of any English soldier, though every Continental statesman with whom our peace-statesmen have to deal is a trained soldier, but on the extent to which he is able to persuade the vast majority of his countrymen. It often seems to him an almost hopeless task; because, in presence of such statements as those of Mr. Hiram Maxim or in presence of such a question as that which was put by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, 'Why should not we invade France by the Tunnel just as likely as they us?' the number of data which he has to bring before them is so great, if they really think it necessary that either of these arguments requires answer, that the task would be endless. All he can hope to do is to persuade those who think of taking 'a debating advantage' in the matter that the stake for which they are playing is the life of their country.

Nothing has been proposed in regard to the new Tunnel that was not carefully considered by Sir Archibald Alison's Committee. The power of flooding the Tunnel, the power of blowing it up, were all taken into account. Perhaps the tower at sea, which is now proposed as a means of flooding, is in form a new thing. It has every objection that was raised against the previous proposals, and many more. Ultimately, every conceivable scheme must depend upon human vigilance. Human vigilance has failed nation after nation. Why should we escape? That is undoubtedly what was meant by Sir Archibald Alison's Committee when, after recommending every precaution they could think of, they added that these would not insure safety 'in every imaginable contingency.' What was virtually 'a debating advantage' was taken of these words. They were assumed to mean that the Committee were hedging against what was humanly speaking impossible, and the very words gave encouragement to the advocates of the Tunnel. What they unquestionably did mean was that, after they had done their best, they could not guarantee the safety of England. Never till now have we trusted the safety of the kingdom to the discretion, the readiness, and the acceptance of responsibility of some routine officer or man. As Sir Evelyn Wood, speaking from experience of a time when the Dover

garrison was under his command, has told us, he found it impossible to insure a night when he could safely turn out the garrison in such a way as to protect the town. At present that is a matter of detail. With the Channel Tunnel, such a failure would be fatal to the kingdom. What is certain is that no one except the Cabinet will take the responsibility of all that either flooding or blowing up the Tunnel would entail, and that the very last people who are likely to take that responsibility at a moment when our relations with some foreign Power are strained are, as the experiences of the South African war have shown us, the Ministers themselves.

F. MAURICE.

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

III

A QUARTER of a century ago the question of making a submarine tunnel between England and France was settled in the negative by general consent. The military authority of Lord Wolseley had something to do with the result. The opinions of eminent persons, Tennyson among others, collected in this Review were not without weight. The Prime Minister of that day, Mr. Gladstone, supported the project, and a Joint Committee of both Houses recommended its adoption by a bare majority. What really defeated it in the end was the feeling that Great Britain ought to remain an island, taking advantage of the 'silver streak' about which Gladstone himself had written so eloquently ten years before. That may be called sentiment; and sentiment, though it governs the world, is much derided by the unwise. My reasons for opposing the Channel Tunnel are not sentimental. Nor are they commercial. Of engineering difficulties I say nothing, for I know nothing. That the Tunnel, once it was made, would pay I am quite willing, for the sake of the argument, to admit. But national security is a good deal more important than commercial profit, and I believe that our security would be endangered by the success of this scheme. It is not necessary for my purpose to argue that England could be invaded through a tunnel. Soldiers differ on this point, as on most others connected with strategy and the art of war. It is, however, quite certain that a tunnel would increase the fear of invasion to an indefinite extent. Fancy a tunnel in 1802 or in 1858! Our relations with France are now such that we can laugh at the fears of 1858, though the apprehensions of 1802 were no laughing matter. We have a fleet, I know. There is a large and influential class of persons who think that they add to your stock of information by telling you that business is business, or that they belong to the blue-water school. We all admit that business is business, and we all belong to the blue-water school. But panics are not the result of reason, nor are they got up by reasonable men. Nothing could be less rational than to suppose that Louis Napoleon meant to invade

England when he was making himself unpopular in France by concluding a commercial treaty with Cobden. But the idea, or delusion, cost nine millions, and if Gladstone had not been Chancellor of the Exchequer would have cost a great deal more. What it might have cost if there had been a railway under the Channel is better only guessing. Scares and panics do no good. They have nothing in common with that prudent fear which is the mother of safety. They lead not to judicious insurance, but to profligate waste. The present Government came into office with professions of economy and obligations to save. Nothing is easier than to promise reductions; nothing is more difficult than to carry them out. To avoid the reckless encouragement of extravagance is a modest and attainable object. It used to be said that steam had bridged the Channel. Steam, however, has also immensely magnified the value of naval strength. If the Channel were tunnelled, the Army and Navy Estimates would speedily grow beyond the control of the most resolutely prudent financier. Old-age pensions would dwindle out of sight, and a shilling income-tax would soon be regarded as the distant dream of an Arcadian past. Do the Labour party want to exchange old-age pensions for conscription? If so, let them vote for the Channel Tunnel Bill, and they will soon be gratified. We escape conscription, with all its economic and social evils, because we have no frontier except the sea. The sea is the best of natural frontiers. The worst of scientific frontiers is a tunnel. The French, we are told, are not afraid of being invaded by England. Well, I am not afraid of being invaded by France. I am afraid of those who are afraid of it. But if we had a large army, as within a few years after the Tunnel was constructed, we should have, there would be as much uneasiness on one side of the Channel as on the other. England is not the only home of unreason. There is Chauvinism as well as Jingoism. There are mischievous firebrands in every army, in every Parliament, and on every Press. France, we hope and believe, will always be the friend of England, though even now the Clerical party are grumbling at the alliance. But France is unfortunately not Europe, and it is with the whole Continent that the Tunnel would be a connecting link. To discourage foreigners from coming here is foolish. But we do not want to become a Continental nation, with compulsory service and taxes that crush. 'It is so difficult,' said the ambitious author to Richelieu—'it is so difficult to write a tragedy in five acts.' 'And so easy not to write one,' replied the weary statesman. Let us for once sink party differences, and concentrate our energies on not making a tunnel.

HERBERT PAUL.

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

IV

I ONCE ventured to ask Mr. Gladstone if he was in favour of a Channel Tunnel. His reply was eminently characteristic. 'It is not so much that I am in favour of the Tunnel as that I am opposed to the opponents of it.' I pondered the voice of the oracle as a good Gladstonian should; but now, after twenty years' reflection, I still find my place among the 'opponents.' I am fixed there by a conviction even more absolute than that which bound me to my venerated chief; for I have sometimes questioned the wisdom of policies on which he set his heart; but I have never, for an instant, doubted that a Channel Tunnel would be an enormous calamity.

All I write and all I think and all I do with reference to public affairs is governed by the conviction that war is the greatest of preventable evils; that the military spirit is the most deadly foe of human progress; and that the best blessing which a country can enjoy is to be 'confident from foreign purposes.'

The proposal of a Channel Tunnel touches this conviction in all its branches. Those who, like myself, have, all through their thinking lives, been ranged on the side of democracy, have experienced one, and only one, serious disillusionment. We always held that—

> War is a game which, were their subjects wise,
> Kings would not play at;

and we believed that, when once democracy had secured its hold on government, there would be an end of the military spirit. We have learnt by practical experience, as in the case of the South African War, that this was an illusion; we have found our own democracy as ready as any autocrat to provoke and to condone a war; and we have no sufficient reason for believing that the democracies of the Continent are more pacifically inclined. In this condition of the world, our main security for peace, tranquillity, and social progress is to be found in our physical isolation. It surely must make the most enormous difference to the safety of a State whether the cruel and clamorous jealousies of rival nations are circumscribed only by a river, a mountain range, an invisible line arranged by treaty: or are kept at

arm's length by the friendly sea. We who worship peace could wish the Channel wider; but we must be content with the defence which Providence assigned us. To fling away that defence—by far our strongest—would surely be tantamount to national suicide.

Second only to actual war, in the scale of national misfortunes, is the apprehension of war. Not for nothing are 'rumours of wars' coupled with wars among the phenomena of the Great Tribulation. When the eyes of a people are habitually fixed on the military signs of the times; when men live and work under the impending sword; when the very existence of the State is perpetually imperilled by the contingency of a war for life or death, all moral and social advancement stands still. The higher interests of humanity, the pursuit of truth and beauty, the gradual subjection of the brutal instincts of man's nature to the moral law—all these are arrested by the apprehension of war. Where that apprehension broods, man becomes merely a fighting animal; everything that tends to make the apprehension more vivid quickens the fighting instinct to a keener activity; and everything that quickens the fighting instinct retards incalculably and indefinitely the only development which makes a nation really great. To be free from actual warfare is, indeed, the chiefest of national boons; to be free from the apprehension of it is a blessing scarcely less to be esteemed.

An absolute security of peace is, perhaps, unattainable until the military spirit is exorcised from the nature of civilised man. But unless Christianity is an imposture, and civilisation a sham, that exorcism will one day work its spell; and in the meantime whatever tends towards that security is an immeasurable boon, whatever makes it more remote a corresponding evil.

Here, in brief, is my indictment against the Channel Tunnel. It would destroy, for the mere indulgence of a whim, our chief protection against actual war. It would link us physically to that network of military mechanisms which covers the Continent with the appliances of bloodshed. It would make the chances of attack from without so much more numerous and more threatening that even the most resolute opponents of militarism would be forced to divert their attention from the sciences which prolong life, and the arts that beautify it, and the ideals which elevate it, and to concentrate their powers on problems of national self-defence. 'History may record other catastrophes as signal and as disastrous, but none so wanton or so disgraceful.'

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

V

I HESITATE to express any opinion as to the Channel Tunnel. So much depends upon technical considerations of which few are competent to judge; so much more upon contingencies and uncertain events which even experts cannot forecast. I assume for my present purpose that all that is said by sanguine promoters as to the commercial advantages of their scheme and the expansion of trade which must follow is true, and—what is, of course, much contested—that no steam ferry could prove almost equally convenient. I look at only one aspect of the question; one which may some day disappear, but which for the time seems of importance. Whatever helps to destroy or weaken the belated tribal feeling, the mixture of intolerance and ignorance, which often passes for patriotism, is to be welcomed. The presumption is in favour of an undertaking which promises freer and more frequent intercourse between this country and the Continent. That the Tunnel will one day be made I do not doubt. But to construct it to-day or for some time to come is inexpedient. The Tunnel can wait; it ought to wait, I think, for reasons which I state with diffidence and with something like envy of the confidence of those who pronounce this or that opinion in regard to this matter 'absurd,' 'ridiculous,' or 'delusive.'

The answers to two or three questions appear to me to be decisive. Will the construction of the Tunnel lead to a demand for an increase of military or naval forces, the erection of a first-class fortress, large additional fortifications at or near Dover, or an increase in armaments in any form? Is that demand likely to be acceded to, or is it certain to be rejected? It may be an unreasonable demand; few are good judges as to this. The point of consequence is whether those who persistently press upon the Government fresh expenditure will not base new demands upon the construction of this road into the realm, and whether in some mood of the public, in presence of a danger, real or imaginary, this plea will not be successful? There is the fact that many military authorities hold that the construction of the Tunnel

will weaken our position, and will introduce a new and perplexing factor into the problem of national defence; that a strong fortress must be erected and a large body of troops concentrated near its mouth; that no precautions against surprises consistent with the safety of passengers can be entirely effectual; that just as the mined tunnels in the Vosges were not blown up in 1870 in time to prevent the advance of the Germans, so the most careful arrangements to destroy the Tunnel in case of invasion may fail at the critical moment, and that an invader could with much greater ease make good and maintain his footing in this country if he had access to and from the Continent by tunnel.[1] Whether Lord Wolseley, Sir Lintorn Simmons, and other soldiers who expressed this opinion in 1883 and have since repeated it, are wrong as to this I cannot say, but one cannot assume that a Government would not yield to professional opinion, backed, as it is sure to be, by a large body of public opinion. Nor is this the time to make such an experiment. A struggle is going on between those who desire disarmament and those who no less ardently desire an increase of forces, between the adversaries of conscription and its advocates, including many who would prepare the way for it by saturating the youth of the country with a love of military exercises. It seems to me highly inexpedient that while this contest is undecided anything should be done to give fresh colour or pretext to the arguments of those who would imitate the military policy of France and Germany. The Tunnel will be, it is said, all in the interests of peace. I distrust a pacific movement which calls at once for a costly entrenched camp or fort and the presence or proximity of a *corps d'armée*. Fill up moats and raze walls and bastions and construct tunnels by all means, but not if there are to be at once more soldiers, new forts, or more ships.[2]

Whether people are now more prone to scares than their forefathers is uncertain. But undoubtedly, for reasons which it would be interesting to analyse, there is a morbid susceptibility to panic in regard to the safety of the realm. At short intervals fear seizes multitudes. There is a cry for larger armies and more battleships. Many newspapers are always preaching this to their readers. Can one doubt that the existence of the Tunnel would foster and encourage this tendency? It would be the panic-monger's best and unfailing weapon. Perhaps a hole in the earth some twenty feet in diameter ought not to endanger a nation; the notion that it will may be, to use the late

[1] 'I do not believe that anything we could do, short of universal conscription and liability to service, would meet the case' (evidence of Sir Lintorn Simmons before the Select Committee of 1883, p. 220). 'The military objections to the submarine railway will only lose their force and application when England adapts her army system to that of the Continent' (a writer in the *Militär Wochenblatt* quoted in *Times*, 15th of April, 1882).

[2] See as to admission that the Tunnel would alter the conditions of defence, Draft Report of Chairman of Select Committee of 1883, p. xvii.

Sir Edward Watkin's favourite expression, a 'hobgoblin.' But hobgoblins scare—at all events the timid and excitable, who are never few or without influence; perhaps never more common or with greater influence than now.[3]

A third consideration must be present to every student of international law. Of late years there have been many instances of wars begun without a formal declaration or even any clear warning; a sudden march is made, the frontiers are crossed, a fortress or position of vantage is seized, and a victory is won; while the diplomatist is still speaking, the soldier strikes. In this respect there has probably been deterioration instead of improvement in international law. The rules of pre-Christian warfare were as to this superior to ours. The majority of modern authorities hold that such notice is not obligatory. There is a very strong body of opinion that, with the conditions of warfare in these days, the giving of such a notice is impracticable. Many of the older writers thought otherwise; they looked forward with confidence to a time when civilised nations would submit to such a restriction. They were mistaken. It can scarcely be doubted that, if the great military States of the Continent were asked to bind themselves to-day not to go to war without always giving reasonable warning to an adversary, they would decline to pledge themselves. Such refusal is compatible with honourable conduct; for the acts of nations are often better than the doctrines or maxims of their advisers. But can one dismiss as preposterous and chimerical the fear of a sudden attack or surprise raid, so long as nine-tenths of modern writers declare it to be permissible and the chief States of the world reserve to themselves the right of going to war without notice?

It is difficult to abstain from exaggeration of any kind, and to give due weight to conflicting considerations in making my point—to recognise fully the advantages of rapid transit and the moral benefits of free intercourse between people of different nations, and at the same time to take note of dangers and guard against them. In fairness it is to be remembered that our physical isolation has often been to the interests of peace. The 'wet ditch' of the Channel has saved us from entanglements in 'the amities or enmities' of the Continent; it has served us better than could any equivalent of the Monroe doctrine; it has kept foreign nations from meddling with us, and, in some degree, England from meddling with them. If the construction of the Tunnel were in any way to alter this—if it encouraged, for example, plans for military co-operation with the forces of a Continental ally—we should have lost what no commercial gain would make up for; one would be tempted to harbour some such wish as that expressed by Jefferson, when contemplating the effects of

[3] 'Le gouvernement d'un peuple, à certains moments de son histoire, est aux mains de demi-fous' (Ribot, *Essai sur les Passions*, p. 113).

drawing the United States into the turbid political waters of the Old World.[4]

Parenthetically, it may be remarked that it would be desirable to obtain from the legal advisers of the promoters answers to one or two questions. What complete security is there that the ownership of the undertaking and eventually its control or management will not pass, largely, if not wholly, into the hands of foreigners, some of them nominees, it may be, of their Governments? Another matter is of interest—theoretical interest, it may be—to students of international law. Assuming that England and France can give a company rights over the bed of the sea within the three-mile territorial belt surrounding the two countries—which is doubtful—can any such right be given over the sea bed, or the underlying strata, outside that limit? A somewhat similar question has arisen with respect to the pearl fisheries in the Persian Gulf and off the coast of Ceylon. To say the least, the point is doubtful; and it would be instructive to know whether the promoters can answer it with confidence.

To return to the main question and to conclude: the construction of the Channel Tunnel seems the natural sequel to an unmistakable pacific movement among nations; the fit work for two Governments which had not merely by words and banquets, but by deeds—by measures of disarmament, by large reductions in naval and military expenditure, and by adopting less barbarous rules as to warfare—shown that their fair promises meant much. It would be the appropriate monument to commemorate such a victory. But the monument ought to follow not precede the victory. The Tunnel can wait; it ought to wait, I think. Some of my friends from whom I rarely differ would be glad to see not only one tunnel but several. At present, I think, one would be too many. In better times, when wisdom and love of peace count for more than they now do, it will be otherwise.

[4] 'I can scarcely withhold myself from joining in the wish of Silas Dean that there was an ocean of fire between us and the old world' (Jefferson's *Works*, iv. 173).

JOHN MACDONELL.

THE REVIVED CHANNEL TUNNEL PROJECT

VI

In the discussion of means for improving the railway communications between England and France, and so further cementing the present admirable relations between the two countries, we certainly should not fix our thoughts exclusively on a tunnel beneath the Channel. No one can deny that there are very serious issues involved in any scheme for a tunnel. The most important is no doubt the military question, but there are others also, physical and financial, of much consequence, which deserve great attention. I do not here wish to do more than merely allude to the military and national points of view of the Tunnel, as these have been and will be discussed by expert authorities far more competent to do so than myself. Speaking as a layman, but having as such studied the conflicting professional opinions of soldiers and sailors, I cannot but look upon the piercing of our frontier with what I hold to be well-grounded alarm.

Leaving, then, the military issues to others, I would point out that physically the difficulties in making the Tunnel might prove to be insuperable, for if any serious fissure in the chalk were encountered no human beings could work under such a water-pressure as would be developed. I do not mean to prophesy that such a fissure will be met with; on the contrary, I think the information collected points the other way, but the non-existence of a fissure cannot be demonstrated until the full-sized Tunnel is completed throughout its entire length, and even the making of a heading from shore to shore will not guarantee that no fissure will be encountered in the larger cross-sectional area of the Tunnel itself. No one can deny the possibility of such a disaster, and it is a matter which certainly ought to be considered as of grave weight in the balance of pros and cons of a Channel Tunnel.

Then again there is the financial side of the question, assuming that all is well in the matter of construction. Is it possible that the net realizable traffic from a Channel Tunnel can pay interest on such an expenditure as is talked of, say sixteen millions of money, or on a cost of some 600,000*l.* per mile? Under the circumstances of the case, and with water competition both for goods and passengers still

remaining, it seems to me impossible that the financial result can be even moderately successful. So far as this country may be asked to bear its share of the financial burden, it may be said that the capital expenditure and working expenses should be apportioned in view of the mileage affected, inasmuch as the Tunnel is expected to increase the traffic on the mileage of the existing railways in the two countries. If so, the shorter mileage between London and Dover as contrasted with that between Calais and Paris would indicate that the lion's share of the expenditure should fall on France. However this might be arranged between the two nations, the expenditure of 16,000,000*l.* of hard cash for improved means of communication—while the sea competition will always exist not merely between Dover and Calais but also between all the ports of the two countries, strikes me as a financial difficulty of the first order. From this point of view the Channel Tunnel is obviously very different from the great tunnels which pierce mountain ranges.

But, as I have said, we are not under the necessity of considering a tunnel as the only alternative to the existing means of communication; for there cannot be the slightest doubt that a railway ferry offers many comparative advantages, and avoids the difficulties to which allusion has been made as inseparable from a tunnel.

A railway ferry across the Channel was propounded in 1872 by Sir John Fowler, and was almost authorised by Parliament. It is said that the project was defeated by the casting vote of the Chairman of a Committee of the House of Lords. If any one desires detailed information on what was then proposed he cannot do better than read the article written by Sir John Fowler in this Review of March 1882, when (ten years after his defeat in Parliament) Sir John Fowler, with all his experience as a railway engineer, returned to the charge and put the case for a ferry before the public by many cogent arguments. He quoted in support of his views such authorities as Mr. T. E. Harrison, engineer of the North-Eastern Railway, on the railway questions; as Mr. G. Fosberry Lyster, engineer of the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board, on the required harbour construction and pier arrangements; as Sir E. J. Reed, Mr. Samuda, Mr. Laird, and Lord Armstrong on the shipbuilding and mechanical questions; and as Sir James Anderson, of the *Great Eastern* steamship, Captain Sherard Osborn, Captain Halpin, and Vice-Admiral Robinson on the navigation matters involved.

Much has happened since 1882, and the views of that date have been amply borne out by much subsequent experience. We know of railway ferries in many countries by which both goods waggons and passenger railway rolling stock are conveniently interchanged across intervening seas and lakes for distances far exceeding that between Dover and Calais, and under conditions of sea exposure at least as great

as between Dover and Calais. On the line of communication between Berlin and Copenhagen, as an instance, but also in many situations, we know that, besides the ordinary rolling stock, restaurant and sleeping cars cross the ferries, and that passengers habitually make their journeys in the cars.

It cannot thus be denied that the scheme of a railway ferry across the Channel is perfectly feasible, and could be made convenient and even luxurious, avoiding all break of bulk for goods, and all change of carriage by passengers, unless a change to the deck of a large steamship be preferred. Sir John Fowler proposed to treat his ferry ships for passengers as large railway stations, with waiting rooms, refreshment rooms, and every modern requirement. The only obvious drawback is that all risk of sea-sickness cannot be eliminated by a railway ferry. But with ships of the large size required for the traffic between England and France, the chance of sea-sickness would certainly be immensely diminished, and its discomforts would be palliated by improved cabin accommodation for those who could not sleep in a sleeping-car through the hour of sea transit, or could not afford the expense of a *train de luxe*. The experience of most persons going down Channel in an ocean liner is that the effects of the sea are not often much felt till Dover has been passed. I do not mean of course to suggest that this is the case with all passengers, nor do I wish to advance the idea that in heavy weather a large steamer will not occasionally be unpleasant between Dover and Calais. That sea-sickness, however, would be very greatly mitigated there can be no doubt, and we may well ask whether for the total elimination of occasional sea-sickness of an hour's duration for a comparatively small number of persons, it can be worth while to spend many millions or to incur grave national risks.

In other respects the question of a Channel ferry has made marked advance since 1872. At that time there was no sufficient harbour at Dover, and a heavy expenditure would have been there necessary, for the protection and accommodation of the large ferry steamships. Now we have a superb harbour at Dover, with ample depth of water at all times of tide, and the works to instal a railway ferry on the English side are, comparatively speaking, negligible.

On the French side of the Channel better harbour accommodation than now existing would undoubtedly be necessary. Whether this should be given at Calais or Boulogne, only four miles further away from Dover, or at some intermediate point, such as Audrecelles (one mile nearer to Dover than Calais), where the forty-feet contour line of depth is only about six hundred yards from high-water mark, is a matter on which one could not without considerable study express an opinion. The matter is not merely one of engineering but also for commercial investigation, in view of the requirements of the French system of railways.

As at Dover, so also at Boulogne long breakwaters have been

made, enclosing a large sheltered area, but at present a for large vessels at all times of tide has not been provided. Though Boulogne may be more convenient for a terminus of the ferry than Calais for Paris, Switzerland, and the South of France, as it saves the railway journey between Calais and Boulogne, the situation of Calais for Belgium, Holland, and the North of Europe is better. Thus, in spite of part of the harbour work required being already in existence at Boulogne, the balance of advantages of situation may be with Calais, and of course the extra four miles of sea is against the selection of Boulogne, although a longer discrepancy of distance has not prevented the development of a large passenger as well as goods traffic between Folkestone and Boulogne.

With the knowledge of what can be done on sandy shores by modern dredging plant (which has been immensely improved since 1882), it is, I venture to say, merely a question of which position offers the greatest advantages, all things considered. We have only to look at the development and maintenance of deep water approaches to such ports as Ymuiden, Dunkirk, Liverpool, Durban, and Port Said, all on sandy coasts, to see that a good French harbour for the railway ferry presents no difficulties, and would not involve more than a very small fraction of the cost of a Channel Tunnel. It is obvious that money spent on any of the French ports would be for the advantage also of general trade, which is a point not to be lost sight of by our allies in considering the cost of installing a railway ferry with large ships.

It must, of course, be admitted that the journey would be shorter in time by a Channel Tunnel; but here, again, the comparative shortening is not really of much importance. The ferry would, I suppose, provide a speed of twenty-three knots, or nearly twenty-seven statute miles, an hour, and the railway speed through the Tunnel may be assumed at about forty-five statute miles an hour. If we may assume that some stoppage for the exchange of electric engines and other matters takes place on the railway at both ends, such stoppage would, wholly or in part, counterbalance the time expended in running the trains on to and off the ferry steamers. Considering the relative velocities of the train and ship, we may probably with sufficient accuracy arrive at a difference in time of about thirty minutes in favour of the Tunnel route. This is but a slight percentage of the duration of a journey to Paris, the Riviera, Switzerland, or Italy. As in the case of sea-sickness, it does not seem reasonable to incur the risks and cost of a Channel Tunnel for a saving of half an hour, more or less, for passenger traffic.

I have said little about goods traffic, as that matter is unaffected by the above contrasts of the two projects. With goods traffic it is simply a question of the amount of accommodation to be provided, and within reason time is not of importance. It is to be remembered

also that in all probability a very large proportion of the goods traffic interchanged between the two countries would continue to be shipped as at present, as the cost of sea transport will be cheaper, except for perishable and express goods, than railway transport can be. The subject of goods traffic by railway ferries was well dealt with in an article in the *Times* of the 17th of January. It can be developed to any extent, and presents no difficulties on a properly designed railway ferry with sufficient approaches.

There is one other matter to which allusion has not been made—viz., the comparative working expenses of a tunnel and railway ferry. It is a question which must, I think, remain indeterminate. In the case of the tunnel the traffic would be conducted over adverse gradients of considerable length in one or other direction, the cost of which is calculable, but we have no data for the expense of ventilating so long a tunnel, to be worked, no doubt, electrically, but approached at both ends by gradients descending to a very considerable depth. The wind and weather on the two coasts will much affect the question of ventilation from day to day, and we also cannot know what (if any) pumping of infiltrated water in the tunnel may be required. In view of the rainfall and land water on the approaches and condensation, we may, I think, be sure that provision for pumping will be a necessity, but what the annual cost of it may be it is impossible to say. In working the ferry, on the other hand, there would be the expenses of a separate organisation of ships, of shipping and unshipping the trains, of harbour dues, and insurance against sea risks.

On the whole, I think that for present purposes the working expenses may, in the comparison of the two projects, be neglected. It is impossible, as I have said, with our present knowledge to indicate on which side the advantage would be. In the case of the ferry a fairly correct estimate of annual expenses might be made for a given traffic, but this is not the case in regard to a tunnel such as is proposed.

The conclusion from all the above considerations must, I think, be that for a very small part of the cost of a tunnel a railway ferry with the most modern improvements could be installed which would fulfil almost all that a Channel Tunnel could provide. In those things in which the ferry would fall short the issues are nearly immaterial. There could be no difficulty in estimating the cost of the ferry, with its harbour works, and the working expenses could be arrived at, while its beneficial effect in uniting the two countries and increasing interchange of traffic must be undoubted. On the other hand, there are many undefined eventualities in the case of a tunnel, the expenditure must be enormous, and success cannot be guaranteed.

Lastly, and most important of all, the grave military questions of a tunnel are completely avoided by the alternative of a ferry.

J. Wolfe Barry.

RECENT ATTACKS ON THE ADMIRALTY

QUIET people have recently become aware that there is in progress an agitation against the present Board of Admiralty of a very dangerous character. At first it was possible to ignore it as the ordinary well-meaning but misinformed criticism of men seriously interested in the welfare of the Navy. With scolding of this kind we are quite familiar, and we listen to it in the distance, if not with pleasure, at least with tolerance, as the index of a lively popular interest in the Service. It came from the usual sources which we know as well as the east wind and the fog, and there was no need for any man to leave his work to protest against ordinary climatic conditions. But lately the disturbance has begun to ring with a different sound. Statements and figures have been sown broadcast so recklessly untrue, to say no more, that they can no longer be accepted as candid criticism. And they have come, not only from the lower ranks of the Press, where the stress and hurry of early editions will excuse a good deal, but also from writers of a higher class who, at least, had leisure to weigh their words and test their allegations. To this has been added a flood of prejudice eagerly poured over every little untoward incident, such as are inevitable in the life of a great Service and are usually passed unnoticed. The rancour and bitterness with which such occasions have been seized are constantly increasing till, incredible as it may seem, we see a naval officer of high standing, and hitherto widely respected, being carried so far as to come perilously near to fomenting mutiny.

What does it all mean ? We cannot tell. It is in any case needless to peer into the unsavoury background of which our senses make us painfully aware. For there is on the surface one plain meaning which concerns the very life of the country, and which the country should no longer endure.

For some years past a little band of men, whose services the country has never sufficiently recognised, had been awakening us by patient and persistent effort to what was meant by efficient naval administration and real preparedness for war. Some have been in the most honoured ranks of the Press and some in the Services, but all were of one mind. In season and out of season they preached the gospel

of Von Moltke and the German Great General Staff and the possibility of adapting it to our own widely differing case. They taught us that the Navy needs a brain, that it needs direct responsibility each man for his own department—responsibility for war plans, for *personnel*, for material, for supply, and all that makes the active power of a great fleet. They have pointed out to us that the problem has never been solved except by a sound organisation which permits us to choose the right men and fit them in the right places to the best of our ability, and then without meddling to trust them to carry out our work and to hold them responsible if they fail. Above all, they have taught us that this method must apply in its strongest form to the man entrusted with plans of war. For plans of war imply secrecy—ultimately even secrets which must be locked in the breast of the war director alone—secrets which may involve his calling on his colleagues for measures and material which cannot fully be explained to them. In this way and for these reasons your man responsible for war plans must inevitably step into the position of the chief of the General Staff, and when that was done you would have a system under which efficient warfare and efficient preparation for war were possible. Every Commission that sat to consider the question more or less approximately endorsed these views. The country was at last converted and the whole Press took up the cry 'responsibility,' 'preparedness for war,' 'definite plans of operation.' The system was set on foot, the man was found, the thing began to move. Maybe it has not reached to so high a perfection as it will do some day; but with the Sea Lords sitting a Board that is responsible for working the general policy, a First Sea Lord responsible for war plans, with a strong Intelligence Department assisted by the War College at Portsmouth, we have practically all the machinery of a true General Staff suited to our needs and methods.

Then what do we see? Under a masterful hand the machinery begins to move; war plans begin to shape themselves hand-in-hand with diplomacy, finance, and the Army; material begins to shape itself to war plans, and strategical disposition of the Fleet to both. Then incontinently, just as we are realising the good dream which we have dreamed so long, a crowd of little or anonymous men begin to cry an alarm, and demand that the machine shall be stopped and opened up for all the world to see what work it is doing. Such folly would be ludicrous were it not our own, and so full of peril. Can they not see? Amongst the loudest of the rioters are men who were the aptest pupils of those who led the good movement, and who a year ago were shouting most shrilly 'efficiency,' 'preparedness for war,' 'Moltke' and 'General Staff.' Did they really think that such a system could be worked without trust and without secrecy? Did they really think they could demand a full and categorical answer to every question their want of understanding or lack of information

might suggest? Let them for a moment picture a band of journalists and unemployed officers cross-examining the German General Staff in the 'sixties.' Is it even thinkable? And yet the task for which Moltke had to prepare was simplicity beside the problems which confront the British Admiralty. Surely all those who are honest in the outcry have only to think a moment to see that no Staff system under heaven could work under such conditions. Already you have forced out information which as Englishmen you would not have sold to a foreigner for all he could give. And now when there is resistance, and you are answered according to your folly, you cry out that the country is being deceived, that the Admiralty is not to be trusted. Sir Alexander Cockburn, sitting in his place as Lord Chief Justice of England, once laid it down that there is no duty to tell the truth in answer to a question that a man had no right to ask. We may not care to adopt such a principle in civil life, but it is the essence of war. And if you find that in reply to one of your ill-judged demands you have received from the Admiralty less than the whole truth, for most of us it is a reason for trusting them more and not less. To deceive the enemy is a vital part of the work of a General Staff, and you too who hamper and thwart its work are the worst of enemies—for you are within our gates. Nor must you forget when Admiralty Memoranda are issued to satisfy your importunity, and you find them not guiltless of obscurity and even contradiction, that such memoranda are possibly not always intended entirely for home consumption.

This is especially the case where the disposition of the fleet is dealt with, and it is just here where the agitators are most active and the folly of their attitude most glaring. By events almost without parallel the whole political balance of the world has been upset. Europe itself has been metamorphosed almost as completely as it was on the eve of the Seven Years' War. The relations of the Powers are without precedent, and the Admiralty, in concert with the other Departments of State, has to work out from the beginning a disposition of the Fleet to meet the new and unexampled conditions. It is a work not only difficult, but requiring the utmost delicacy. The comity of nations demands that it shall be done decently. The bludgeon must not be flourished rudely in the face of sensitive neighbours with whom we have no quarrel and are on visiting terms. Let us see for a moment how the matter looks to them. In dealing with the reorganisation and redistribution of the Fleet in 1904 Admiral Baron von Maltzahn, one of the highest authorities on strategy in the German Navy, writes as follows:

> It is no longer a matter of 'preparation in peace for the approach of war.' . . . The British Fleet is actually ready for war and is drawn up against Europe. It only remains for it to take up the positions which have been arranged beforehand in the event of war. . . . Never have such measures been carried so far in time of armed peace.

These words, which cannot be denied, were written in January of last year. The attitude of which the Admiral complains has been in process of development ever since.

But this aspect of the situation—what we may call its political aspect—by no means exhausts its complexity. The same events which led to the political dislocation have also brought about a crisis in naval construction. For the first time since steam and iron and rifled guns began, fleets have been tested in a great naval war. We find ourselves suddenly in possession of a new point of view which should give us the means of distinguishing the false lines of development from the true, and enable us to stretch all the inchoate and half-seen elements of modern naval warfare to their logical conclusion. No Board of Admiralty ever had two such problems to grapple with at the same time. Every country is watching the other for a sign. One false step may have consequences beyond calculation. Is it too much to ask the tormentors to pause a moment and consider what a strain it means? Surely the most profound repose attainable on this earth is scarcely deep enough to permit the work being rightly done. Yet the Board of Admiralty, working under a tension almost beyond bearing, and toiling with ungrudging labour beyond all praise, must be assailed from day to day with every kind of interference these patriots can devise. Not a ship can be moved from one squadron to another without their crying that our supremacy is in danger, and demanding the reason why. They cannot wait for the laboriously formed plans to ripen in harmony with the material as it crystallises, and the policy as it solidifies. No! Because they have not the information or the understanding to see at once as far as the men who have been chosen and trained for the work, and who have all the threads in their hands: they cry out for cards to be thrown on the table that they may judge if the game is being rightly played. It is difficult to be patient with demands so preposterous. It is hard to believe that the mass of a people who have schooled half the world in the art of government have so little feeling for the elements of statesmanship. Surely they will not give a moment's hearing to such wanton impatience. Is it so hard to see in these movements the steady and harmonious development of a policy which shall ensure the peace of the world? Can ye not watch but one hour? What is still hidden from you is clear enough to those who most narrowly watch the new system. Here is an extract from an article upon it in the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, of the 1st of November last year. Speaking of the new Home Fleet, which is still in process of development, it says:

> The object is very plain. It shows an extraordinary carefully planned economy. For, just through this new organisation, a reduction of the Budget is attained, since a ship in the Reserve Fleet does not cost so much as one in the Active Fleet. We must, however, warn our readers against the deception

which a number of English Conservative papers *bona* or *mala fide* give out, that the new organisation means a reduction of the English fighting force. Just the opposite is the case.

Those who have made a careful study of former wars or the preparations to prevent them—I do not mean merely from text-books, but those whose lot it has been to pore for many years over confidential State papers and to watch the development of such preparations in their inmost secrecy day by day, even hour by hour—will know that what the Hamburg paper says is solid truth. Such students, without any certain knowledge of what is in the mind of his Majesty's servants, will divine enough to see the general drift and pay homage to the astute and patient statesmanship with which the whole intricate game is being played.

If one who has devoted his life to the study of such matters in the past may say a word to his countrymen, it would be to trust a little longer the men to whom their chosen Ministers have committed the difficult work, and to shut their ears to the noisy 'experts.' Possibly many of these critics are really alarmed. Their tags of strategical lore, their 'instant readiness for war,' 'their principles of concentration,' and the like, imperfectly understood and usually misapplied, are quite enough to scare them. There is an old saying amongst lawyers that nothing is so misleading as a legal maxim. We may surely modify that. If a legal maxim misleads, a strategical maxim without the profoundest knowledge of its meaning is certain to trip you straight into the pit.

One word now, on the personal side of the question; for unhappily that side has been forced to the front too rudely to be ignored. These men who lately were demanding responsibility for plans of war, now that they have got it, are violently protesting against an alleged 'autocracy.' In tones of indignation and alarm they are crying out that the constitution of the Admiralty has been turned into a dictatorship; and to this they add a storm of detraction, which need not be noticed, against the man who is bearing the burden. Is their knowledge of human nature so small that they really believe it possible to find a man worthy of such responsibility who will not assert some kind of domination wherever he is? It is inherent in the personal element of the case, the personal element which, as all great strategists have taught, is the dominant force in war, and the solvent of all rule. It is a thing no plan of organisation can either create or prevent. Do they think they can toss out nature with a pitchfork, or bind the controlling factor in the art of war with a Departmental Minute? Men who can seriously advance such simple criticism are beyond argument. If Nelson were First Sea Lord they would call him a self-willed insubordinate poseur, as indeed he was at times. Or, if they had Drake he would be a vulgar bombastic fellow with no feeling for the traditions of the Service, which is also not entirely untrue.

With such sorry lack of appreciation the country has nothing to do. All its concern is to see that it is well served, and who can say that it is not well served this day ?

It will be asked, Is then no criticism of any kind to be permitted ? Are the mouths of men genuinely interested in the Navy to be closed entirely ? By no means. Not only is criticism to be permitted, it is to be encouraged, provided it be real criticism given with due regard to necessary limitations. It must be remembered that just as free States desiring the higher freedom of federation must each surrender part of its individual freedom, so where you wish to secure the working of a General Staff, and the free play of instructed opinion within its ranks, members of Parliament must forego a little of their right to question and the public dispense with part of its cherished privilege to carp and grumble. It is only the hasty, ill-considered persecution that is deprecated, for that is not criticism, it is irresponsible attack. All of it, or nearly all of it, is destructive ; none of it, or almost none, reveals any sympathy with the men who have to face the unprecedented difficulties of the time, or any real appreciation of the complex problem they are labouring to solve. The pity of it is great. For some at least of the men who are now sinning against their own creed most deeply have done in the past admirable work of the very kind that is wanted. They might well do it again, could they but rid themselves of the habit of critical tippling which has made them a prey to *hysteria navalis*. Constructive criticism, that displays a real desire to assist or even a moderate understanding of the problems at issue, is not likely to be ignored at the Admiralty. It is not the way with any Government Department, and no one who has a piece of honest advice to give need fear he will not be heard because he does not scream it from the house-top.

Again, it will be objected—if the General Staff system demands this self-restraint, this submission on the part of the public, what are we to do when we honestly believe the members of that staff are unequal to their task, are ruining the Navy and imperilling the country ? Are we still to sit silent and passive ? Again the answer is, By no means. There is open to you to use as freely as ever the constitutional means, which were employed in the case of Lord St. Vincent. The case against the Board should be presented to Parliament by the responsible leaders of the Opposition or, if the Opposition be content, by responsible and trusted men in the Government ranks. For this constitutional safeguard, this right of parliamentary inquiry which is so essential to the nation's trust in the Staff system, is an instrument of terrible power and danger. It is only to be wielded by the most experienced hands. Public opinion should forbid it to be so much as fingered by a recruit.

The Staff system rests on responsibility, and responsibility implies a free hand—free, that is, within the limit of our general policy. Without

the one you cannot have the other. It follows you must trust your men or get rid of them. There is no third way. But to get rid of your men in the midst of their half-finished work, to change them for others practically pledged to undo it before ever they know fully the data on which the old men worked, is one of the most serious and responsible steps a popular Government can take. No man of any standing in the counsels of the nation would face it without the strongest provocation and the most overwhelming convictions. Yet every irresponsible assailant seems quite ready to rush in where statesmen fear to tread. It is always a hazard of the gravest kind; it is triply a hazard in the midst of such a crisis in policy as that through which we are now passing. Once it was tried in the midst of war, and by no less a man than the younger Pitt; and in spite of his able leadership, the attempt, after causing incalculable hampering of the machine, recoiled with crushing force upon the heads of him and his colleagues. Now it is true we are not at war, but the situation demands no less undisturbed concentration of thought and work, and no less sustained continuity of policy. To change our team now while we are crossing waters, none the less deep because they are still, must certainly be full of peril, even if the new team proved better. The country should, with all its faith and fortitude, resist such a break; public opinion should sternly silence any agitation which seems to point that way—except on one condition. Nothing should permit such a change even to be considered, except overwhelming *prima facie* evidence that the trust they have given is misplaced.

Has such a case been made out? Will any man standing outside the controversy affirm it? Will anyone assert that, during the administration of the present head of the Naval Staff at the Admiralty, the Navy has not markedly increased in efficiency and readiness for war; that our sea-going fleets are not more numerous and better organised and disposed than they were; that their commanders were ever more wisely selected? Will anyone maintain that our Fleet was ever more efficient or relatively powerful than it is at this moment; that the *personnel* was ever more highly trained, whether in gunnery or in the higher spheres of tactics and strategy; that discipline and strenuous devotion to duty, whether in officers or men, were ever higher? History and living memory are clearly and absolutely against any such contention. Look abroad, and who will declare that our Fleet was ever regarded with more respect? All this is beyond contention, so far at least as a student may speak.

What, then, has the prosecution to set against this triumphant record? Now here we come to another class of critic which we have not yet noticed. If it were merely a question between the men who can show such a record of successful administration and the sufferers from *hysteria navalis*, the public need not hesitate to laugh the whole case out of court. But it is not so. The present administration

is being attacked in the Press by a group of naval officers, of high rank and wide experience, who are either on half-pay or have reached an honoured retirement. They, too, are taking the same grave responsibility as their smaller allies, but it is to be assumed they are doing it deliberately from a pure sense of duty and no personal prejudice, and with a full apprehension of the risk to which they are pushing their country. The words of such men can only be treated with the respect they have earned, and their arguments should be seriously met. To attempt to do so in the compass of a short article is impossible—it would even be lacking in respect—for the indictment has been long and weighty and closely argued. Yet candour compels the expression of a clear opinion, and, so far again as an historian may speak without presumption—and they have called in history freely to their aid—the present writer would maintain, with all deference, that they have entirely failed to make out their case on any one line of their attack. And it is not without ground that historians may intervene. For, seeing how good the present is, the opponents of the Board are forced to look into the future, which they seem to do with genuine apprehension. To get a view forward they have to look back to history to trace the true direction of naval development out of the past, to project it into the future, and so to argue that our present policy is not proceeding on the right line. To history they have appealed, and by history let them be judged.

The main points on which the attack is being made are entry and training, dockyard policy, cruiser policy, big battleships, and fleet distribution. It is impossible to deal with them all. It must suffice to point out generally that the assailants are by no means at one on these points. In the eyes of some the present system of entry and training is the best work of the new school; with others it is ruinous. It is the same with the 'scrapping' of the small and early cruisers, the same with the economy in the dockyards; and while the admirals condemn the *Dreadnoughts*, the tremulous dram-drinkers cry continually for more. Let us take for consideration the two items with which the weightier criticism has dealt most fully—the cruiser and the battleship policies.

Let the cruiser case be taken first, for of all naval problems the future of the cruiser is the most difficult. Beside it the question of the battleship is simple and certain. The charge against the Board —so far as the charge can be formulated from its many inconsistent presentations—is that it has departed from an alleged tradition of naval warfare which differentiated sharply between the cruiser and the battleship type; that, ignorant (so it is frankly said) of the elementary principles of naval warfare, our sea lords have exhibited a tendency to suppress all small cruisers and create in their room a type of vessel which closely approximates to the battleship; and that, contrary to all precedent, they are more and more regarding these cruisers as

part of our battle strength, and that it is consequently becoming impossible to detach them for cruiser work without sinning against the strategical rule of keeping your battle squadrons concentrated. It is further said that as a result of this policy of costly large cruisers, our cruisers cannot be numerous enough for our needs. From the roving and contradictory manner in which this charge is formulated, it is difficult to know whether one has done it justice. For instance, the two ablest writers base their attack on mutually destructive reasons. One condemns the armoured cruiser because for fleet work all its advantages could be obtained by detaching fast battleships to support cruisers of the older type; and the other because the system of armoured cruisers entails detaching part of your battle force for cruiser work. Such contradictions are common and confusing. Still it is hoped the above is a fair presentation of the indictment.

The clearest and most weighty statement of the case for the prosecution appears in a very recent article by one of the distinguished officers above referred to, who throughout has shown himself the ablest and most independent and genuinely reasonable of the opposition. After his scholarly method, he has approached the question from the historical point of view. In a most able and exhaustive manner he has traced the development of the cruiser from Elizabethan times, with the object of showing—unless we mistake him—that there exists this principle in naval warfare which demands a marked differentiation between cruisers and battleships; that all intermediate types are false; and that, whatever our adversaries do, we should cling to the policy of numerous and cheap and comparatively small cruisers.

Learnedly as the case is presented, it is not convincing. It leaves room to doubt whether the story leads quite surely to such a conclusion. As set forth by his careful pen, it seems to tell that all through the days of our sailing fleets we never did differentiate sharply between the two types except once when we followed the French. The logical unsoundness of intermediate types was periodically felt, and yet, in practice, some unformulated exigencies were perpetually compelling us to recur to those types. The point is of high interest and well worth thorough investigation. For the moment, however, the question is different. The graver question is whether the whole of this history is not out of court. A naval historian is the last person in the world to belittle the value of naval history in clearing questions of to-day, but he cannot deny how misleading history may be if we look for guidance on the surface instead of seeking the underlying conditions which give that surface its conformation. The value of history is not only to set forth the experience of the past, but also to show when some radical change of fundamental conditions has made that experience dangerous precedent. Now it is not difficult to show that within the last few years such a fundamental change has taken

place in the conditions of the cruiser problem. This change the Board of Admiralty seems to have recognised with fine penetration while the rest of us were raking the surface.

The main functions of cruisers are twofold—to act as the eyes or screen for a fleet and to destroy or protect commerce. There are of course subsidiary uses for small cruisers, such as inshore work amongst mine-fields, or in combined expeditions, and so forth; but for such work cruisers are not absolutely indispensable. It is the two main and essential functions that must control the type. In both spheres the fundamental conditions of their work have been turned upside down since the era of wooden sailing fleets. In those days it may be broadly stated that after a certain mean was passed the larger a ship was the lower its sea-speed and what the Elizabethans called its 'nimbleness.' To-day the reverse is the fact. The larger a ship is now, by the same broad rule, the higher is its sea-speed, while its 'nimbleness' is practically unaffected. The consequences go to the root of the whole question. In the old days a frigate could lie to windward of an enemy's fleet for days in perfect security, knowing that nothing could touch her or shake her off except superior force of her own class. But in these days of fast battleships such work is impossible to small or even middle-sized vessels. For if you give them the speed to escape you must deprive them of the mobile endurance to sustain their watch. Again, in the sphere of commerce. In the old days a frigate could always overhaul the finest types of merchantmen, like the East and West Indiamen and the galleons of Spain; and if one cruiser was too small to deal with them two could be coupled. Now all this is changed. The great liners of to-day have nothing to fear from any ship or group of ships corresponding in military value with the old frigate. They can outrun them and outstay them. Nor is it merely a question of destroying an enemy's commerce. It is also one of protecting our own. Should such liners be equipped as commerce-destroyers, with their high and sure sea-speed and their enormous storage capacity for coal, how are they to be dealt with by small cruisers?

Here, in these changed conditions, lies the thorniest question of naval policy. How is it to be answered? How are we to steer in this uncharted sea? Clearly there is no salvation in small cruisers. No multiplication of them will compensate for their low sea-speed and small endurance. These qualities can only be obtained in cruisers of the largest size. Shall we then trust to our own merchant liners for the work? They would serve admirably for the eyes of a fleet, but without any considerable fighting power they could not serve as a screen, for they could not drive in the cruisers of the enemy. For dealing with enemy's commerce-destroyers no certain reliance could be placed upon them, and at the same time their removal from their true sphere must cause a grave disturbance of trade. Shall

we then seek a solution in large protected cruisers? The idea commends itself to no one. Some years ago, it is true, France built one or two such ships; but she has not repeated the type, and no first-class naval power has followed her lead. The truth is such ships are very costly in men and money, and are of low fighting power in proportion to their cost. By spending a little more in giving them armour you get a vessel with almost all their qualities, costing no more for upkeep, and of high fighting value. But here comes in the objection that every time you detach them from your fleet you diminish its fighting power. It is a real objection, though by no means so great as it was before the recent rapid development of wireless telegraphy. Still it raises the question whether some smaller type of fleet cruiser could not be devised which would greatly diminish the number of occasions for detaching armoured cruisers—some development or variant perhaps of the scout type which for cruiser work in war would fill the gap between destroyers and armoured cruisers, and in peace time discharge the police duties of the Navy.

Such, roughly stated, is the complex equation that has to be solved. It is one of extraordinary difficulty that no Admiralty yet sees its way through. For no country are the factors more complicated than in our own case, and it is the duty of every patriot, if he cannot assist the solution, to refrain at least from increasing the difficulties of the Board by raising matters of prejudice. The solution will not be helped by intemperate talk about 'scrapping' ships whose *raison d'être* has gone with the advent of new conditions. It is objected that Admiral Togo found such types useful. It is not said in the same breath, as it should be, that he was acting against a battle fleet of the old slow type. Nor are those days recalled—days of terrible anxiety and peril through which he had to pass at the zenith of the crisis, simply because he could not throw such weak cruisers as far forward as the strategical dilemma demanded. Nor, again, is it any help to assert that armoured cruisers were a failure in the late war. Such a statement cannot be supported on the evidence, at least so far as it is available. In any case it is a serious responsibility to make such a statement without at the same time pointing out that the Japanese themselves are not of this opinion. They, with all their experience, are now building six cruisers. Five of these are armoured vessels of about 14,000 tons, and one is of the older type of 4,000.

The question of the big, one-calibre, high-speed battleship requires similar treatment, but space will not permit. It may, however, be pointed out, that here again the historical argument is misleading. The able officer already cited has sought to show, in tracing the development of the capital ship, that increase in size gives no superior battle strength, because there is a law of 'equality,' which always comes in, compelling your adversary to increase the size also, and

leaving you in the same relative position as before. The net result, in consequence, is that you either increase the cost of naval defence or diminish the number of your units. Yet his careful study of the process reveals clearly that line-of-battle ships, and indeed, frigates, did go on increasing in size till the end of the period. How is this to be accounted for? Were our constructors, and those who controlled them, from first to last all as misguided as the present Board is alleged to be? Surely not. The explanation is that the story, as the distinguished officer tells it, reveals another law, the law of 'inequality' or 'over-trumping.' His candid statement of the facts tells us, in spite of himself, that this is a law as overbearing and certain in its action as the law of 'equality.' We, and the French, have been mainly responsible for it. We have played the game over and over again, but never with results more disturbing to our neighbours, or more comfortable for ourselves, than when we put down the *Dreadnought*. The card has been well and boldly played, but none the less is it certain that the old law was forcing the hands that played it. Whether we are conscious of it or not, it is a law of unyielding power—no more to be resisted by our present Board than it was by the great naval first lords of the eighteenth century. No matter how the Exchequer may complain, the law will go on working like the tide till a point is reached when it is proved beyond a shadow of doubt that increase of size no longer increases fighting value, or till some consideration of material bars further growth.'

Now for some time past we have been listening to a very earnest contention that this dead point, at least so far as fighting power is concerned, has been passed in the *Dreadnought* design. The arguments in favour of this view have been ably presented, amongst others, by Captain Mahan in America, and by scarcely less respectable authorities in this country, in France, and in Italy. Yet the fact remains that they have entirely failed to convince the Admiralty Staffs of any naval power. The tactical advantage of a shortened line, and to some extent of high speed, the facility of fire-control, the increased protection for guns and gun-crews, and the higher power of hitting which this type secures overweigh all the argument of the accomplished opposition. It is never pleasant to find that the theorists and the practical men are not at one. To serious people it must bring a sense of uneasiness and anxiety. But in this case there seems to be a clear explanation. It is that the theorists are once again arguing on the surface, while active men have probed to the bed-rock. The use of naval tactics is to enable you to hit your enemy more often and more severely than he can hit you. The theorists count up the weight of metal that a ship of the old type can deliver and find it is greater than that of the new. For them this settles the matter. The practical men, however, count the hits as demonstrated in battle practice, and find that for reasons well known to the

gunnery staff, the advantage is distinctly on the side of the one-calibre 12-inch type. And beyond this there is the additional accuracy and sustenance of fire due to the fact that undeniably in the new type the gun-crews can be protected to an extent that was impossible in the old.

In combating the advantage of the shortened line, it must be said, with great reluctance, that some of the opposition seem for a moment to have lost their grip of the theory they advance. They argue that the massing of guns in a few big ships is contrary to the great military principle that you should distribute your guns and concentrate your fire. Now the preoccupation of every admiral in command of a long line is to manœuvre it as tightly closed up as he dare. He is fighting instinctively all the time against the principle of distribution. The fact is that what is meant by distribution ashore is something radically different from ranging your batteries as close together as you can in one line. It means separating them as widely as possible so as to secure the most disturbing cross-fire. We cannot but unwillingly admit that the respected authorities who have advanced this argument have stumbled over a strategical maxim which they have not paused to analyse. The fact is that it will not apply to the naval line of battle, and so far as it is applicable to sea warfare at all, it is an argument, not for numerous small ships, but for breaking up your fleet into free-acting groups or divisions.

That such arguments have been set forth by serious authority is unfortunate. It is just the kind of reasoning that makes practical men impatient of theory. Yet the arguments come from the very men who have done most to persuade naval officers how much there is to be learnt from theory and history. Indeed, we can read beneath all they write on these points, and they even have at times openly said so, that the effect of the new school will be to make the Service rely on material rather than upon the sagacious study of tactics and strategy and the whole art of war. That apprehension deserves all sympathy, and honours those who feel it. But is there—in our Service at least—any ground for it? In any case, it is certain that during the reign of the new school the desire to see the art of war studied methodically, which the salt of the Service has so long striven for, has been pushed steadily forward to a point it has never attained before. It is also true that the very men who are most closely and deeply engaged in these studies are just those who are most securely convinced of the practical and theoretical correctness of the one-calibre big battleship.

Of the charge which is most loudly brought against the Admiralty and the Government, that they are letting our standard of naval power fall below the safety limit, nothing has been said. The fact is that the charge is quite untenable—it has not been supported by any journal of first-class standing, nor by any writer of weight, no matter

how great and genuine his mistrust of the present Board. Nor can any such indictment be drawn, except by taking all that it is said that foreign nations say they are going to do as done or nearly done, and crediting our own administrators with every quality which they have fully demonstrated they do not possess. There is no case, and they know there is none. Hence the sporadic cry for 'inquiries.' In the Temple they know the device well as an attorney's trick to extract facts on which to found a case. They call them 'fishing interrogatories.' It is a sport which judges severely repress. Let public opinion severely do the same. Such inquiries, even when well founded on a decent *prima facie* case, are serious evils, in that they interrupt work, distract the office concerned, and end, if they end in anything, in our overworked administrators consenting to some compromise, wholly indefensible on any theory, in order to rid themselves of the annoyance and get to honest work again. In the present case it could only end, as it did in Lord St. Vincent's case, by proving that the very points on which he was most acrimoniously attacked were just those on which he had deserved best of his country and the Service.

For all of us there are points in the present policy with which we do not agree, or, to put it more modestly, of which we do not understand the meaning. But which of us has so much confidence in his judgment upon such matters as in self-communing solitude to assure himself such doubts are grounds for an inquiry? Of course there are many whose deep interest in the Navy fills them with a craving to know, but are they really ready to answer to the country for stopping the machine at this moment and inevitably revealing matters of priceless value to our competitors, gratuitously, which nothing could bribe them to disclose? For this—and let there be no mistake—this is what inquiry means. Seriously, is it not time to stop, as a high national duty, before further harm is done, and we become a laughing-stock to the world?

JULIAN S. CORBETT.

GERMANY AT THE PARTING OF THE WAYS

Up to the year 1866 we pursued a Prusso-German policy. From 1866 to 1870 we pursued a German-European policy. Since then we have pursued a world policy. . . . The war of the future will be the economic war, the struggle for life on the largest scale. May my successors always bear this in mind, and always take care that Germany will be prepared when this battle has to be fought.—Bismarck to Bucher, *Bismarck-Portefeuille*, iv. 127.

The German Empire has become a world-empire. Our countrymen in their thousands have spread all over the earth. German science, German industry, German productions, cross the ocean. The German property afloat on the seas is worth thousands of millions. It is your duty, gentlemen, to assist me in my task of organically connecting the Greater Germany with our Fatherland.—William the Second's Speech, the 18th of January, 1896.

With profound anxiety have I observed the slow progress of political interest and understanding with regard to world-political problems among us Germans. If we look around us we find that in a few years the aspect of the world has changed. Old world-empires are decaying and new ones arising. In consequence of these changes the tasks of Germany have mightily grown and require on my part and on that of my Government unusually heavy exertion—exertions which can be successful only if they are supported by a united nation free from divisions, and by a people ready to make sacrifices.—William the Second's Speech, the 18th of October, 1899 (nine days after Mr. Kruger's Ultimatum).

A GENERAL ELECTION is usually a long expected, rather dull and purely domestic event, which is of serious interest only to the citizens of that State in which it takes place. The impending General Election in Germany forms an exception to the rule. Instinctively recognising the world-wide importance of the crisis which seems to be developing in Berlin, the whole world has, since the sudden dissolution of the Reichstag on the 13th of December, watched the development of affairs in Germany with the keenest attention. This is not to be wondered at, for even now people in Germany are vainly trying to solve the enigma why, without sufficient cause and apparently for no intelligible purpose, the Reichstag was dissolved, and they are asking themselves whether that step emanated from the Emperor or Prince Bülow. In the following pages an attempt will be made to penetrate the mystery which surrounds the dissolution of the

Reichstag and to investigate the political position of Germany both in its present aspects and its vast future possibilities.

According to Article 18 of the German Constitution 'the Emperor appoints and may dismiss the Imperial officials.' In other words the German Government, the Imperial Chancellor and his Secretaries of State, are appointed by, and solely responsible to, the Emperor, not to Parliament. They are the Emperor's servants. Whilst the Emperor may at will appoint and dismiss the Chancellor and the other Ministers, and therefore absolutely directs the Executive, the Reichstag holds as absolutely the purse strings of the nation. Therefore no measure brought forward by the German Imperial Government —one might almost say the German Emperor's Government—which involves the spending of money can be carried through unless the Government is supported by a Parliamentary majority. Hence the German Government is compelled by some means or other to secure a Parliamentary majority for those measures which it wishes to carry through.

For a long time the Government has relied for support mainly upon the Conservative party, and upon the conservatively inclined and purely Roman Catholic Centre party. The former party, representing mainly the agricultural interest in Eastern Prussia, where the large landed proprietors sit, was gained by the imposition of high protective duties upon agricultural produce; the latter was won over by various measures favourable to the Roman Catholic Church, and to the Roman Catholic section of the community. It may be said that during the last few years Germany has been ruled principally in the Conservative interest. Therefore it was only natural that the Conservative party followed blindly the lead of the Government, whilst the Centre party acted merely as auxiliaries. The Centre party being rather secretly than openly favoured by the Government, and seeing many of its wishes remain unfulfilled, used every governmental request for support as an opportunity for exacting some adequate return. Hence the governmental measures could be carried through the Reichstag only by bargaining and negotiating with the Centre, and by giving way inch by inch before its demands. Whilst the Conservative party formed a solid phalanx which was always at the beck and call of the Government, the Centre party habitually criticised and carefully examined all governmental proposals, and found difficulties and raised objections until its conscience was appeased by an adequate *quid pro quo*. In this manner, rather more than less *bona fide*, had the Centre party lately examined the ever-mounting expenditure for the very unpopular war in the South-West African colony, and had objected to a sum of 400,000*l*. I am credibly informed that a few friendly words spoken behind the scenes would have caused some Centre members to absent themselves during voting and to give a majority to the Government.

However, these words were not spoken, and the governmental demand for this trifling sum was rejected by a small majority.

A defeat of the Government in the Reichstag is by no means a serious matter. Numerous important national measures proposed by the Imperial Government have been defeated by the Reichstag and have been quietly dropped by the authorities. A Parliamentary defeat does not lead to the resignation of the Government in Germany, as it does in England, but may, in cases of exceptional gravity, lead to the dissolution of the Reichstag at the hands of the Government; for, according to Article 24 of the German Constitution, 'The Reichstag may be dissolved by a resolution of the German Governments represented in the Federal Council with the consent of its president, the Emperor.' Constitutional theory and constitutional practice are two different things. In view of the great preponderance of Prussia in Germany, one may almost say that, as a rule, the Reichstag may be dissolved at will by the German Emperor.

So far the extreme step of dissolution has been resorted to only if measures of the greatest national importance were rejected by the Reichstag—measures which gave to the Government a good case in appealing to the people for a Parliamentary majority more favourable to its policy. Therefore the German people received with a feeling of astonishment bordering upon amazement and consternation the news that the Government had dissolved the Reichstag and appealed to the people because the Centre party wished to examine a sum of 400,000*l.* to be spent in the South-West African colony, a waterless wilderness, which has never brought in anything, which will probably never bring in anything, but which so far has cost Germany the lives of 2,000 soldiers and more than 20,000,000*l.* in money.

German politicians and journalists have propounded numerous widely different theories as to the reasons which caused the Government to dissolve the Reichstag, but so far they have not solved the puzzle because they have searched for profound political combinations and deeply hidden wisdom, and have overlooked the obvious. To put the matter plainly: A statesman who, with the worst of cases, appeals to the people, acts as recklessly as a private man who, with the worst of cases, appeals to the law. Prince Bülow has made a grave tactical mistake in appealing to the people with the worst and the weakest of causes, and has lost the last shred of credit which he used to possess in Germany, rather owing to his high office than to his ability. People in Germany used to call Prince Bülow a gambler. Now they call him a 'Hasard-Spieler,' a plunger. His supporters in the Press treat him with discourtesy, his enemies treat him with open contempt, and whatever the result of the election will be it seems certain that his prestige is shaken.

In fairness to Prince Bülow it must be doubted that he deliberately appealed to the people for a majority upon the most conspicuous

and the most discreditable example of mismanagement which occurred during his whole Chancellorship. Therefore we are bound to assume that the dissolution of the Reichstag was resolved upon in a fit of temper by one greater than the Imperial Chancellor whose actions are habitually as dramatic as they are unexpected. It is true that Prince Bülow has publicly and privately asserted that he was solely responsible for the dissolution, but that assertion must be treated with considerable caution. Prince Bülow is a gallant man, and he is rather a skilful courtier than a statesman. In his official oath Prince Bülow had to swear 'to be a faithful and obedient servant to the Emperor, and observe the Constitution and laws of the Empire,' and he no doubt considers it his duty as a loyal servant to the Crown to shield his master even if he has to sacrifice himself. Convincing internal evidence, which it would be tedious to give here at length, justifies us in concluding that the Reichstag was dissolved on the spur of the moment by the German Emperor, and against the opinion of his responsible Minister.

The question now arises: What was the object of the German Emperor in dissolving the Reichstag, and what will be the consequences of that ill-timed step upon the composition of the new Reichstag and upon Germany's policy?

The German Emperor has much cause to be dissatisfied not only with the late Reichstag, but with the Reichstag as an institution, for it has crossed the Emperor's intentions in numerous instances. It has rejected many measures dear to his heart and some which he had solemnly pledged himself in public speeches to carry through, such as the celebrated Anti-Strike Bill (Zuchthausvorlage), the great Canal Bill and others. The policy of the Reichstag is totally at variance with the Emperor's personal policy, and the Emperor cannot help seeing in the Reichstag the principal obstacle to that policy which he and many other patriotic and far-sighted Germans consider to be of the very greatest importance to their country.

Modern Germany has become great and prosperous, not through natural development and through chance, but through the ability, the activity and the ambitions of the Emperor's ancestors. By the foresight and the wise and energetic action of the Hohenzollerns and by their forceful, and often violent, policy the poor little territory of Prussia, which 200 years ago had about 1,500,000 inhabitants, has become Modern Germany, the mightiest and the wealthiest State on the Continent. Therefore the policy of *laisser faire* and non-interference, the policy of folded hands and neglect, has few champions in the leading circles of Germany and none among the Hohenzollerns. Since the position of Germany in Europe has become secure, a new problem has arisen for that country. The most important problem of Modern Germany is how to find room for her rapidly increasing population. In 1871 Germany had 41,000,000

inhabitants. At present she has 62,000,000 inhabitants, and the population is growing now by 900,000 every year as compared with an increase of only about 380,000 in Great Britain. According to Professor Hübbe-Schleiden, the German population will, by natural development, increase to 150,000,000 in 1980. At present immigration into Germany is from three to four times larger than emigration from Germany. Therefore the foregoing figure may even be exceeded. Owing to the fruitfulness of the German mothers and still more owing to Germany's boundless prosperity—for the supply of men is determined by the demand for men—the Germans multiply much faster than do other nations, and every year a new record is established in the increase of the population of Germany. It is true that, owing to the marvellous expansion of all her industries, including agriculture, Germany can at present feed almost 1,000,000 new mouths every year; but at some time or other Germany must become too small for her population, and then the German workers, the real wealth and power of the country, compared with which all other possessions such as territory, gold, silver, factories, ships, &c., are of little account, will have to leave their country for foreign States to the weakening of Germany. By the ability of the race and by the fruitfulness of the German mothers Germany, after having become supreme in Europe, may become a world-empire and may become supreme in the world if elbow room be found. On the other hand, if Germany cannot expand she may in fifty years, relatively speaking, be a small and greatly over-populated State of the second rank, unable to hold her own against the great world-empires.

The foregoing are the secret thoughts of every far-seeing German patriot, and especially of the Emperor, whose policy is summed up in the mottoes printed at the head of this article, and we may read between the lines of almost every one of his speeches his anxious thought that Germany can remain great only if she becomes a world-empire. Therefore all his political actions, however erratic and contradictory they may appear at first sight, are perfectly logical and consistent if we bear in mind his fundamental political ideal, and his determination.

As the colonial world is divided up, Germany cannot expect to acquire peacefully colonies in a temperate zone, but she must be prepared to follow the example of all the older colonial nations and conquer the territory which she requires. The history of all times shows us that wealth and power, territory and empire, are not to the peaceful and the feeble, but to the daring and the strong—that ships, trade, and colonies are the gift of the ocean. In the preamble to the great German Navy Bill of 1900 Germany gave, plainly and somewhat indiscreetly, notice to all the world of her intentions. The words introducing the Bill, 'Germany must have a fleet of such strength that a war against the mightiest naval Power would involve

risks threatening the supremacy of that Power,' are a warning addressed to this country. They are an unmistakable declaration of policy, and, changeable as the Emperor is in matters of minor importance, his actions in all parts of the world have proved his determination to carry out his great policy. They show that he means to obtain colonies and found a world-empire, peaceably if he can, but by war if he must. Therefore he requires a fleet able to overawe, and if necessary overcome, the mightiest naval Power, Great Britain.

For the great naval programme of 1900, 200,000,000*l.* were voted by the Reichstag, but that programme was recognised to be insufficient in the light of the Russo-Japanese War which had clearly established the superiority of the largest battleships over those of lesser size. All German naval and military experts agreed that the German naval programme required an enormous extension, and that ships of the very largest size ought to be substituted for the medium-sized ones built hitherto. Many generals, admirals, and other experts declared publicly again and again that it was necessary to double the naval programme of 1900. The exceedingly powerful German Navy League, with its 1,000,000 members, an almost official apparatus for promoting the extension of the navy by agitation, which is ostentatiously patronised by the Emperor and many of the ruling kings and princes of Germany, also demanded the doubling of the fleet, and it was probably not uninspired from the highest quarters.

Among the agitators for the increase of the fleet none was more prominent than Lieutenant-General von Liebert, an ex-Governor of German East Africa, and a *persona gratissima* in the highest circles. In company with Admiral von Rosendahl he travelled from town to town, holding lectures in which he told the people that the position of Germany was serious and threatening, and similar to that of Prussia in the early sixties. He reminded his hearers that already then William the First and Prince Bismarck foresaw the war of 1866 with Austria for the hegemony in Germany, and the consequent war with France for the hegemony in Europe and the consolidation of the German Empire. Therefore they thought it necessary to double the Prussian army; but as the short-sighted Prussian Parliament would not vote the necessary funds, Bismarck resolved to rule without a Parliament, to double the army, and to find the necessary funds by illegally extorting them from the taxpayers. According to General von Liebert, Germany was in a position of the greatest danger, and required the doubling of her navy, which ought to be effected in any case either with the consent or without the consent of the Reichstag. The fact that General von Liebert was allowed to preach the gospel of violence to the people, and to recommend publicly an Imperial *coup d'état* in a country where the actions of all retired officers are carefully watched and controlled, seems to indicate that his views were approved and countenanced in the highest circles.

At the time when von Liebert and the German Navy League were agitating for the doubling of the fleet, the Government, no doubt, desired to double the naval programme of 1900; but it avoided a conflict with the Reichstag by demanding the substitution of the most powerful battleships for those already voted, and the addition of six cruiser-battleships of about 20,000 tons each. Thus an additional 50,000,000*l.* were obtained towards the construction of a fleet 'of such strength, that a war against the mightiest naval Power would involve risks threatening the supremacy of that Power,' and in a few years Germany will possess some twenty battleships, every one of which will be stronger than our own *Dreadnought*.

Even these mighty armaments were thought to be insufficient. In the course of the last year, the voices clamouring for a further and immediate increase of the German navy became louder and louder. In word and print the German people were told that a supreme effort was needed, that Germany must make a bid for naval supremacy by outbuilding the naval programme of Great Britain. However, the agitation was bound to be fruitless, for it was clear that the late Reichstag would not be found willing to vote the huge additional sums required. What was to be done?

During the last few years many of the most prominent members of the German Conservative party, the Imperial and patriotic party, who had seen the Imperial policy opposed, or at least modified, by the Liberal elements in the Reichstag, have demanded that the German masses should be deprived of their votes, so that the Imperial policy might be carried out without hindrance. That demand was again loudly put forth immediately after the dissolution of the Reichstag in the Conservative press, especially in the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, the *Post*, the *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, and others. In view of these repeated demands of the Conservatives for a *coup d'état* on the part of the Emperor, it is most noteworthy and most significant that Prince Bülow issued on New Year's Eve an electioneering manifesto in which he spoke of the danger of reaction arising from the growing influence of the people as represented by the Social Democratic party, which was hostile to governmental authority, property, religion, and the Fatherland, and threatened the people with the sword of Bonaparte. This astonishing manifesto was drawn up in form of a letter, and was addressed to the same General von Liebert, who, twelve months earlier, had travelled all over Germany recommending a *coup d'état* for the doubling of the navy. This coincidence is decidedly curious. The relations between the Emperor and his Parliament have become more and more strained, and his advisers have counselled him more and more loudly to destroy the power of Parliament relying on his army. Will he listen to that advice and repeat the experiment which Bismarck made in 1862 with the same success?

From various incidents which occurred during 1906, such as

Colonel von Deimling's brusque and offensive declaration in the Reichstag that a certain military railway would be built in South-West Africa by the will of the Emperor, notwithstanding the rejection of that scheme by the Reichstag, it seems clear that for many months past the Government contemplated dissolving the Reichstag in order to obtain a majority likely to vote huge sums for a practically unlimited extension of the German navy. The late Reichstag, having voted about 50,000,000*l.* for the increase of the German navy, was unlikely to vote further considerable sums for naval purposes. Therefore it was only natural that those who desire Germany to be strong enough at sea to challenge 'the mightiest naval Power,' as the Navy Bill of 1900 put it, wished to have another set of men in Parliament who were more likely to vote the funds required for that purpose, and quite logically they worked for a dissolution.

The German Government might have obtained the great patriotic majority required had Prince Bülow played his cards with greater skill. He might have created an incident with one of the great naval Powers, and then have demanded a huge credit vote from the Reichstag. Had that vote been refused, the people might have been rallied round the Government with the cry 'The Fatherland is in danger.' Such a cry would have strongly appealed to the imagination and to the patriotism of the German masses, and would probably have produced a majority willing to vote a shipbuilding programme exceeding that of this country.

The untimely dissolution of the Reichstag, which apparently was resolved upon without plan and without reason, is thought likely to lead to a great increase of the anti-governmental majority, formed by the Centre party and the Social Democrats, as an examination of the party-political position of Germany will show. At the time of the dissolution of the Reichstag, the Centre party, with its allies, such as the Poles, could count upon more than 120 votes, and the Social Democrats, who are always in the Opposition, upon 80 votes. The Reichstag has 370 members. Therefore, the Government can, in the new Reichstag, count upon a friendly majority only if the combined forces of the Centre and of the Social Democratic party should lose a number of seats to the Conservatives and to the various disunited parties which represent middle-class Liberalism. However, it is not expected in Germany that the combined forces of the Centre and the Social Democratic party will be weaker in the new Reichstag than they were in the old one.

The Centre party has a magnificent organisation. Every Roman Catholic Church is a party centre, and every Roman Catholic priest is an agent to the Centre party. Voting for the Centre is almost a religious duty for German Roman Catholics. Besides, three quarters of the supporters of that party are living in the country and in the smallest towns, deriving their support directly or indirectly from the

rural industries. As the big landowners in Eastern Prussia are the backbone of the German Conservative party, so the peasants in southern and western Germany are the backbone of the Centre party, and the intensely Conservative Roman Catholic peasants of Germany do not easily change their political views, especially as they are contented and prosperous, for the increase of the protective duties on foreign corn and meat has made the rural industries of Germany exceedingly flourishing. For instance, during the last ten years, the quantity of grain produced in Germany has increased by almost 20 per cent., whilst British agriculture has been decaying, and during the same period the number of cattle has increased by 2,000,000 heads, and the number of pigs by 7,000,000 heads, most of which are possessed by peasants, whilst the number of cattle and pigs kept in this country has remained stationary. The cheap food argument which appeals to the Social Democratic town-dwellers has no influence on the German peasant. Hence it seems likely that the Centre party will enter the new Reichstag in almost undiminished strength, especially as the Government will hardly succeed in its attempts at splitting up that well-disciplined party.

Whilst the Centre party should at the worst lose a few seats, the Social Democratic party may greatly increase in strength. In view of the great part which that party may soon play in Germany, it seems worth while to cast a glance at the development of that powerful and most interesting party which is apparent from the following table :

Year of Election	Total Votes Polled	Social Democratic Votes Polled	Percentage of Social Democratic Votes to Total Votes	Social Democratic Deputies Elected
			Per cent.	
1871	3,888,095	123,975	3·20	2
1874	5,190,254	351,952	6·78	9
1877	5,401,021	493,288	9·13	12
1878	5,760,947	437,158	6·12	9
1881	5,097,760	311,961	6·12	12
1884	5,662,957	549,990	9·71	24
1887	7,540,988	768,128	10·12	11
	1888. Accession of William the Second			
1890	7,228,542	1,427,289	19·75	35
1893	7,678,973	1,786,738	23·28	44
1898	7,752,698	2,107,076	27·18	56
1903	9,495,586	3,010,771	31·71	81

The foregoing figures show a triumphant progress from insignificance to power which, I think, is unprecedented in the history of party. At present the Social Democratic party is, as far as numbers are concerned, by far the strongest party in Germany, and it is not only strong in numbers, but also strong by its perfect organisation and discipline.

Whilst the German Conservative party and the Centre party are primarily country parties, the Social Democrats are a town party. In the country and in the small towns only from one-fourth to one-fifth of the population gave their votes to Social Democratic candidates at the last German election; but in the towns of medium size more than 40 per cent., and in the large towns more than 55 per cent., of the voters were Social Democrats. Since the last election the population of the large towns has so greatly increased, and Social Democracy has, especially by its agitation against dear food, won so many new adherents that it is generally expected that the Social Democratic vote will greatly exceed 3,000,000 votes at the coming election.

Since 1871 no redistribution of seats has taken place in Germany. During the last thirty years the German country population has remained almost stationary, whilst the German towns have vastly grown. Consequently the Conservative country is greatly over-represented in the Reichstag, whilst the Social Democratic big towns are greatly under-represented in it. According to the proportion of votes cast, the Social Democrats ought to have occupied 126 seats in the late Reichstag instead of eighty-one actually obtained, whilst the two Conservative parties should have lost twenty-five, and the Centre party twenty-two seats. Some day this glaring inequality will have to be adjusted, and then the town will rule the country in Germany. At present the country rules the town.

Neither Bebel nor Liebknecht, but the present Emperor, has been the greatest Social Democratic agitator. The labouring masses in the German towns have been driven into the ranks of the Social Democratic party, largely in consequence of the political mistakes and of the rash speeches which that impetuous monarch has made. From the table given in the foregoing, it appears that before the accession of William the Second to the throne, only 763,128 Social Democratic votes were given. In 1903 more than 3,000,000 Social Democratic votes were polled, and in the present election many more Social Democratic votes may be registered. The Social Democratic party may become a danger to the present form of Government in Germany.

During the last few years the Social Democratic party has made a most vigorous agitation against the high protective duties on all agricultural produce imported into Germany. Articles on 'Bread-Usury' and on the 'Meat Famine' have daily been published in the Social Democratic press of Germany, and have thence found their way into the British Free-trade Press. From these highly sensational articles it would appear that Protection has created the Social Democratic party in Germany, that the German working man is groaning under Protection, and is exceedingly poor and ill-used, whilst the British working man, enjoying the blessings of Free Trade, is highly paid, well nourished, flourishing, and happy. This picture is a fancy

picture. The German working man, far from being poor and ill-used, is fully occupied, very well paid, and very well fed, and so exceedingly prosperous that I have no hesitation in saying that the average German working man is incomparably better off than is the average British working man.

Unemployment is practically unknown in Germany, as a comparison with Great Britain will show. Between May 1903 and the end of 1905, unemployment among the aristocracy of British labour, the Trades Unionists—statistics exist only about these—was on an average 5·8 per cent.; whilst during the same period unemployment among *all* the workers of Germany was only 1·7 per cent., and it was only 0·8 per cent. during the third quarter of 1906. Unemployment is always worse among the unorganised and more or less unskilled workers than among the Trades Unionists. Therefore, if the percentage of unemployment among British Trades Unionists was 5·8 per cent., the percentage of unemployment among all British workers must have been at least from 8 to 10 per cent. Hence it follows that for every unemployed worker in Germany there are at least from five to six unemployed workers in Great Britain. The enormous proportion of unemployed in Great Britain and the small one in Germany explains the fact that, between 1900 and 1904, 1,077,587 British workers emigrated from this country, whilst during the same time only 140,774 workers emigrated from Germany. As the population of Germany is 50 per cent. larger than the population of Great Britain, it follows that, proportionately speaking, for every German emigrant there are eleven British emigrants. How good employment is in Germany may be seen from an article on the German Labour Market in 1906, which, on the 4th of January, appeared in the chief Social Democratic organ of Germany, the *Vorwärts*, from which we learn that 'during 1906 there was an exceedingly large immigration into Germany of workmen from foreign countries, and all of these found work very rapidly and easily.' In a manifesto addressed by the leaders of the Social Democratic party to the people, which was published in the *Vorwärts* on the 15th of January, we read:

> If we look ahead as far as we are able we shall not suffer from over-population in Germany. We have in Germany not too large but TOO SMALL a number of workers, as may be seen from the fact that FOREIGN WORKERS BY THE HUNDRED THOUSAND are imported into Germany. In 1881, when Germany had a population of 46,750,000, 210,547 Germans emigrated. In 1905, when Germany had 60,600,000 people, only 28,075 Germans emigrated. If Germany suffered now from over-population not 28,075, but at least 270,000 Germans ought to have left the country last year.

The foregoing proves that there is in Germany not a scarcity of work and consequent unemployment of labour as there is in this country, but that there is a superabundance of work and a great scarcity of workers.

As regards the dearness of food in Germany, of which we have heard so much during the last few years, it is quite true that the prices of food have considerably risen in that country. It is also quite true that, if we take the wholesale prices of corn and meat, living is cheaper in Great Britain than in Germany. However, if we look into retail prices and the general cost of living, it appears that living is much cheaper in Germany than in this country. Therefore many English people with reduced means go to Germany, where money goes further than over here. It is a fable that bread is cheaper in Great Britain than in Germany. This assertion can easily be tested by the most superficial tourist, who will find that he will get only one or two rolls for a penny in Great Britain whilst he will get from three to four rolls—and better rolls too—for ten pfennigs (1¼*d.*) in Germany. The 'consumer' of the text-books of political economy can benefit from the cheap corn prices in Great Britain only if he buys the grain for his bread by the ton.

Although the prices of bread and meat have risen in Germany during the last few years, wages have apparently far more rapidly risen. Therefore the savings of the German working man have very quickly increased of late, and are now accumulating at an unprecedented rate, as the *Statistische Correspondenz* reports, whilst in Great Britain, notwithstanding nominally high wages and nominally cheap food, the precariously occupied working man lives from hand to mouth and is unable to put money by. Thirty years ago the savings of the British working man were greater than those of the German working man, but of late matters have tremendously changed in favour of Germany, as the following figures show.

—	British Savings Banks Deposits	German Savings Banks Deposits
	£	£
1901	192,000,000	478,000,000
1907	209,000,000	650,000,000
Increase ...	+ £17,000,000	+ £172,000,000

From the foregoing figures it appears that the savings of the German wage-earning class deposited in the savings banks are more than three times larger than those deposited in the British savings banks, and that during the years under review the German savings banks deposits have increased a little more than ten times faster than the British savings banks deposits. Whilst the British population places at present only about 3,000,000*l.* per year into the savings banks, the German population places yearly the enormous sum of 35,000,000*l.* into the savings banks. It may be objected that the British working man places much of his savings into provident societies, building societies, &c. I am acquainted with the facts and with the figures, but I would mention that the German working

man has invested several hundred million pounds—a far larger sum than the corresponding British item—in the governmental and private insurance societies, building societies, co-operative banks and societies, land banks, &c.

The tale of the German working man's prosperity is not yet finished. Whilst Great Britain cannot afford to insure her workmen against accident, disease, and old age, Germany protects with her State insurance societies all her workers, male and female, 18,376,000 in number, as may be seen from the official statistics. The German State insurance societies have between 1885 and 1904 paid to the German working man 125,000,000*l.* on account of sickness, 53,000,000*l.* in compensation for accidents, and 50,000,000*l.* in old age pensions, or 228,000,000*l.* in all. In 1904 the German working man received from the State insurance societies the enormous sum of 25,638,614*l.* in compensations, and the funds in hand of these societies amount to more than 90,000,000*l.*, a sum about twice larger than are the funds kept at the Bank of England. To sum up, the cash savings of the German working man in the savings banks and other institutions are much larger than is the whole British National Debt, and the German working man will receive during the next six or seven years more money from the State insurance societies than is held by the British savings banks. Compared with the irregularly occupied and poor British working man, the German working man is a Crœsus.

The prosperity of the German working man is apparent not only from the unprecedented accumulation of small savings in Germany, but also from the unprecedented consumption of luxuries among the working classes which I have observed all over Germany, and the official statistics of the imports of those articles which may be considered to be the workers' luxuries confirm my observation. Between 1895 and 1905 the imports of butter into Germany, for instance, have increased from 990,000*l.* to 3,687,500*l.*; the imports of feathers for bedding have increased from 670,000*l.* to 1,211,700*l.*; the imports of poultry have increased from 1,272,000*l.* to 2,686,400*l.*; the imports of eggs have increased from 3,720,000*l.* to 6,067,500*l.* That all these enormous increases have taken place, notwithstanding the very great increase of import duties, and Germany's vast production of the articles enumerated, is certainly a most remarkable evidence of general national prosperity.

We have been told that the German working man is crushed by Protection and defrauded of his earnings by dear food, and that he has in consequence become a Social Democrat, whilst the British working man flourishes under Free Trade and cheap food, and is happy and prosperous. The foregoing facts and figures disprove these statements.

Notwithstanding their great prosperity the German working

men are politically discontented, and we cannot be surprised at it, for man is a political animal. The German working masses thirst for power, but they have practically none. They would like to influence legislation, but their views are not heard, and they are treated as enemies to the country. Clumsy attempts to destroy the Social Democratic party, when it was small and weak, led to its growth and consolidation. Persecuted Social Democratic leaders became martyrs and heroes in the eyes of the German working man. By sheer bad management the whole army of German wage earners was forced into the ranks of the Social Democratic party, and through persecution and vituperation that party has been embittered to such an extent that it has, like our own Irish party, but one practical political object—to oppose the Government.

Hitherto the opposition of the Social Democratic party has been rather annoying than formidable to the Government; but if a hundred or more Social Democratic members should be sent to the Reichstag they might hold the balance of power in that assembly and their opposition might imperil the realisation of the Emperor's vast plans. If the Government should not be able to obtain in the new Reichstag a majority for a further great extension of the fleet, which, I have been told, is planned, a conflict between the Emperor and his Parliament appears to be not unlikely, for it seems impossible that the Emperor should abandon his life's work after twenty years of constant exertion and capitulate either to the Centre party, which is now in opposition or to the Social Democratic party, which the Emperor hates and despises. The difficulty could not be solved by placing some of the Social Democratic leaders into high office, for the rank and file of the party would most probably abandon them and continue opposing the Government. The latent conflict between the Emperor and the Reichstag may soon become acute.

The Social Democrats may eventually become the predominant party in the Reichstag, and the various pseudo-Liberal factions will probably then by the laws of gravity and of self-preservation incline towards, and eventually be swallowed up by, the Social Democratic party. The various Liberal parties which represent the manufacturing and trading interests and profess middle-class Liberalism are, largely through their material interests, divided among themselves. These parties had before the dissolution agreed to work together, forming a Liberal block; but as soon as candidates had to be nominated on joint account their solidarity disappeared, and their internecine quarrels broke out afresh. Middle-class Liberalism lacks unity of purpose in Germany.

The large number of parties in the Reichstag—there are usually from twelve to twenty parties—makes it difficult for the foreigner to understand the party-political position in that country, which at first sight appears chaotic; but if we look more closely into it we find that there are in reality only two large parties, or rather groups

of parties—a Conservative country party and a Liberal town party—which are opposing one another; and if we analyse the Parliamentary position we find that there is a struggle in progress between rural Conservatism and town Liberalism, between agriculture and industry, between Kaiser and people, between North and South. It is worth noting that the South German States are the strongholds of Liberalism and of Social Democracy, whilst Prussia is the stronghold of Conservatism. Therefore the Reichstag's resistance to the Emperor's policy is applauded loudest in the South German States. Their opposition is, to a large extent, a protest against the Prussianising tendencies of Berlin. The sharp geographical division between the two great groups of parties, between the Emperor's party and the People's party, is perhaps not without danger to the future of the German Empire.

The political position in Germany promises to become soon an interesting and perhaps a very serious one. The latent conflict between town and country, between the Emperor and the people, may become acute. If the new Reichstag does not give to the Government a majority willing to extend Germany's naval armaments very considerably, we may either witness another dissolution which will probably be managed by an abler hand than that of Prince Bülow, or we may witness an attempt to destroy the Social Democratic party by depriving the electorate of the franchise, a step which Prince Bismarck had already planned.

According to Article 78 of the German Constitution, 'Changes in the Constitution can be undertaken only by legislation [in other words they require the assent of the Reichstag], and they are vetoed when opposed by 14 votes in the Federal Council.' The Federal Council of the German Empire is composed of 58 members, representing the Governments of the individual States of the German Union. Prussia has only 17 votes, and the remaining 41 votes are held by the smaller States. Consequently a few of the minor States, such as Bavaria, Saxony, and Würtemberg, could, according to the Constitution, by their joint opposition veto the destruction of universal suffrage in Germany. However, as the desire of the smaller States to live at peace with their mighty neighbour Prussia may prove greater than their desire to preserve the existence of the Reichstag in its present form, their opposition might be overcome by negotiation. Hence a *coup d'état* for weakening the power of the Reichstag may more easily be initiated than many people in Germany imagine, but no one can tell what the effect of such a *coup d'état* would be. Such a step might lead to a general strike or to worse commotions caused by the Social Democratic party, or it might lead to the most serious complications between Prussia and the Southern States of Germany; for the 'Reform of the Franchise' which is clamoured for by the Prussian Conservatives would make the Emperor almost absolute

in the Empire, and destroy the power of the smaller States and of democracy in the South.

Apparently the Parliamentary position in the new Reichstag will be not very favourable to the Emperor's plan. The position in that assembly has become unfavourable to him chiefly in consequence of bad management on the part of the Government. With some good management a conflict between the Emperor and his Parliament may be avoided. Hence we may soon see a patriotic Reichstag assembled at Berlin which will give to the Emperor the means of building his great fleet. If the German Government appeals to the people on a great national question, the patriotism and the spirit of self-sacrifice among the German population may supply all the Emperor demands, especially as he can reckon upon the support of some most powerful patriotic organisations, such as the German Navy League with 1,000,000 members, the German Veterans' League with 2,300,000 members, and the League of German Gymnasts with 800,000 members. The united forces of these societies would, if a great patriotic issue is skilfully put before the nation, probably overwhelm the forces of Liberalism and of Social Democracy.

If a patriotic Reichstag should be elected, Germany might soon challenge in earnest the supremacy of the British fleet. The next few years, perhaps the next few months, will show whether Germany will become a World-Power and a danger first to Great Britain and eventually to the Anglo-Saxon race, or whether she will remain a European Continental Power which confines her activities within the limits of Europe. Germany stands at the parting of the ways.

To those who are of opinion that Germany cannot compete with Great Britain on the sea because Great Britain is much wealthier than Germany, I would say that Germany, which was formerly much poorer than Great Britain, is now undoubtedly much wealthier than this country. In support of this somewhat startling assertion, I would give a few facts. Germany and the individual States composing it have a very large national debt, but against that debt they possess very considerable assets. Of these the Prussian State railways alone, which earn a profit of 7·52 per cent., would suffice to pay off the whole of the indebtedness of the Empire and of the individual States. The wealth of the masses in Germany is apparent from the details given in the foregoing. The wealth of the classes has increased apparently even at a more rapid rate than that of the working men, as the following statement, which has never before been published in this country, clearly shows :

	Income subjected to Income-tax in Prussia	Income subjected to Income-tax in Great Britain
	£	£
1892. . . .	288,069,881	587,151,200
1905. . . .	501,041,023	619,328,097

As figures relating to the income subjected to income-tax and applying to the whole of Germany are not in my possession, I can give only those for Prussia. The income of the classes of Germany should be about 50 per cent. larger than that of Prussia, and amount for 1905, roughly speaking, to 750,000,000*l.*, as against 619,000,000*l.* for Great Britain. Income-tax is levied, and income is estimated, on different principles in the two countries.* Therefore the two total sums given are not strictly comparable. However, the foregoing statement is of the greatest interest, inasmuch as it shows that the income of the classes in Germany has increased by about 70 per cent. during a period when it has remained practically stationary in Great Britain. The trifling increase of about 15 per cent. of the income subjected to income-tax in this country is merely equal to the increase of the population during the same period. Therefore, individual wealth has apparently remained almost stationary in Great Britain. However, in view of the fact that the British income-tax collectors have of late years 'put the screw on' in an unprecedented manner, it seems likely that the income of Great Britain has in reality remained stationary, or has more probably decreased, during a time when it has almost doubled in Germany. Germany is no doubt at present by far the wealthiest State in Europe, and she can well afford to challenge Great Britain on the sea, especially as her population is not only exceedingly prosperous, but also very lightly taxed. I would for instance mention that, according to Von Kaufmann, local taxation in England is 150 per cent. higher than local taxation in Germany. In other words, for every 1*l.* paid in local taxes by German citizens, British citizens have to pay 2*l.* 10*s.*

Whether Germany will be able to challenge Great Britain on the sea depends evidently not on Germany's wealth, for that is more than sufficient for the purpose, but on the will of her people. On the day after the dissolution of the Reichstag the leading semi-official organ of the Government, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, proclaimed that the coming General Election was to decide whether Germany was to grow from a European Great Power into a World-Power. That question will apparently be determined very soon, but it may be determined only after a severe struggle between the forces of Conservatism and Liberalism, between the Emperor and the Social Democratic masses. That struggle may become a bloody one. The last issue of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* gives an interesting article from the pen of Professor Delbrück, and the last issue of *Die Grenzboten* gives a still more interesting one written by Otto Kaemmel, about the *coup d'état* which Bismarck planned in 1890. According to these weighty articles, Bismarck saw in the Social Democratic problem chiefly a military one. He clearly foresaw the great development which, since 1890, has been taken by the Social Democratic party. He recognised in it a danger to the power of the Empire

and to the position of the Emperor. Therefore, according to a conversation with Herr Kaemmel, he advised William the Second frankly to treat the Social Democrats as revolutionists, and disfranchise them. William the Second rejected Bismarck's advice, saying: 'I will not begin my rule by wading in blood ankle deep.' 'Then your Majesty may have to wade in blood more than ankle deep later on,' was Bismarck's reply. It seems by no means impossible that Bismarck's forecast may come true.

J. Ellis Barker.

Post Scriptum.—Since the foregoing was written the results of some of the first ballots have been announced. To the profound surprise of all competent observers the Social Democrats have lost a considerable number of seats which have fallen to the Conservative and Liberal parties. Although we have to wait for the results of the second ballots before we can judge of the party-political position in the new Reichstag it seems likely that the advocates of naval and colonial expansion will form the majority.

Before the present election the Germans have been asked by their leaders to choose between a policy of militant imperialism and adventure accompanied by sacrifice in the shape of high taxation and dear food and a cheap policy of industrial and social development beneficial to the individual. Notwithstanding the general disgust which the colonial scandals, which led to the dissolution of the Reichstag, have excited throughout Germany, the German people have selected the former policy and have shown to the world that they prefer future greatness to immediate advantage, that they place national above personal interests, that they prefer power and glory to cheap food.

The results so far announced are not a triumph of Prince Bülow—for he is probably as astonished at them as is everybody else—but a most significant triumph of German Imperialism. The German masses have voted in unprecedented numbers, and they have in the first ballot unmistakably given their verdict in favour of the Emperor's vast world-political aims. Therefore the result of the present election may be of far-reaching importance to various nations, and especially to Great Britain.

J. E. B.

WOMEN AND POLITICS

On behalf of a great though silent multitude of women, I desire to set forth some of the grounds on which we shrink from the proposed abolition of our present exemption from the office of electing members of Parliament. This change, if made without any serious attempt to ascertain the wishes of the women of England, may inflict upon them, against their will and without a hearing, a grave injustice.

I am not about to attempt a full discussion of the whole subject, that being a task for which I am by no means competent. Nor is it my purpose to argue against the proposed measure. My objects are (1) to urge the claim of women to be consulted before any such unaccustomed share in the work of the country is assigned to them; and (2) to contribute towards the full and deliberate consideration of the question in all its bearings by calling attention to some of the pleas which women of the more retiring type are either unable, or for obvious reasons unwilling, to put forward for themselves.

(1) With regard to the first question—viz., the claim of women to be consulted before the introduction of any measure so profoundly affecting their interests, and through them the interests of the whole nation—a very few words will suffice, for there can scarcely be two opinions as to the desirableness of the step if practicable. And it could hardly 'pass the wit of man' to devise some method by which the opinion of women could be ascertained. There can be no impossibility about a referendum, however unfamiliar to us may be the necessary machinery. In this way, and in this way alone, we could ascertain what is the real wish of Englishwomen in this matter. We who object to the change would assuredly be glad of the opportunity of protesting; while the women who are agitating for the suffrage could not without obvious inconsistency demand that it should be given without reference to the wish of 'one half the nation.' We may be wrong in thinking that the change in our position would be disastrous. We cannot be wrong in maintaining that it should not be involuntary.

(2) But to set forth the grounds on which many women are strongly though silently opposed to the measure is a far more arduous task. The difficulty of approaching the subject from a point of view

distinctively feminine, and at the same time purely human, is great, though, I trust, not insuperable. It arises, of course, largely from those habits of reserve, and those surrounding shelters of convention and tradition, for the continuance of which we have to plead. Many women, I am sure, are silent in this controversy, not only because their education may have in some degree unfitted them for the public advocacy of their cause, but also because the very cause itself which they would advocate—the cause of reserve, of modesty, of personal dignity and refinement—appears to forbid public discussion of a position which till lately has seemed to be 'its own security.' It can, however, no longer be held that the subject of the right position of women is sufficiently protected by our better instincts from public discussion; and since those who wish for a change are restrained by no such scruples as I have referred to, it would, indeed, be misplaced modesty to allow judgment to go by default.

The difficulty of discussing the question of female suffrage to any good purpose is also greatly increased by the impossibility of detaching it from the much larger and deeper problem of the right general position of women, and the feminine and human ideals to which that position should correspond and contribute. The question of the suffrage, indeed, is but an incident, so to speak, in the great movement of the last century towards what is called the 'emancipation' of women. That movement has, no doubt, been mainly for good. Much has been gained for women and for the race by the removal of many restraints and causes of oppression from the lot of women, and by the opening to them of various spheres of activity and means both of self-support and of education from which they were formerly debarred. Yet none but a bold, not to say a blind, partisan of 'progress' would venture to deny that the price paid for these gains had been a heavy one. With the removal of restraints it was inevitable that special protections should also be removed. With the opening of careers for women it was inevitable that they should become, more than of old, recognised bread-winners. It may be good that all doors should be open. It does not follow that it must be equally wise to pass through them all. No one can deny that there is need for caution in going forward; and we are now confronted with the demand for a further step in the same direction, by which in the name of justice and of equal rights a real injustice, as many of us feel, may not impossibly be wrought. For the equalisation of conditions or of tasks, in disregard of unequal abilities, is manifestly injustice. Whether women can in any sense be considered as 'equal' to men appears to be a question as idle as it is interminable; but there is no need to consider it, since women are certainly handicapped by natural burdens from which men are free.

The women whose profound, though often unspoken, reluctance to the proposed addition to their duties and responsibilities I am en-

deavouring to interpret, do not regard the question as mainly referring to the value, or the best distribution, of a particular bit of political machinery; but as involving that of the right and fair division of labour between the sexes. We regard the suffrage not as conferring a necessarily advantageous position, but rather as the symbol, and to some extent the instrument, of a public participation in political functions; not as a prize to be coveted, but as the token of a task which should not be indiscriminately imposed—a task not to be lightly undertaken, or discharged without encountering both toil and opposition. We think that justice and fairness consist, not in ignoring actual differences, but in so adjusting necessary burdens with due regard to the lines of irremovable difference as to secure the most even distribution of pressure. We believe that the fact that Nature has irrevocably imposed certain burdens on our sex constitutes a claim, as a matter of justice, that we should be relieved from some part of those functions which men are competent to share with us.

That we have hitherto been exempt from political and electoral duties is, we believe, the natural result of the universal and partly instinctive recognition of this piece of elementary justice. It cannot be in fairness attributed to any doubt of our 'worthiness' to take a part in national duties and responsibilities. Rather it is owing to the belief, unquestioned till yesterday, that other methods of sharing such duties were more worthy of our already burdened strength. It has hitherto been felt that woman's time and woman's best energies were not only more fitly occupied, but more economically bestowed, in discharging those duties which she alone is capable of undertaking. And who can estimate the importance to the whole nation of the right and unhindered performance of those duties?

It is often said that the suffrage could be no grievance to the women who do not wish for it, because they could always abstain from voting. Individuals, of course, could abstain. But is it reasonable to suppose that women generally, if placed by the deliberate act of the nation in the position of electors, could maintain their present sense of exemption from the call to investigate for themselves the opinions and qualifications of candidates, and the mechanism and probable working of the particular measures to which candidates might be willing to pledge themselves? Any woman could, of course, abstain from voting; but would this shelter her from being canvassed for her vote? Is it possible to suppose that a constitutional change of such magnitude as the extension of the suffrage to women would leave unaltered the prevailing view of the right relative position of the sexes? It is not the convenience or the wish of either sex, still less of individuals, that we have to consider, but the good of the nation. The proposed change may be for good or for evil, but it is idle to deny that it would be far-reaching and important in its effect on all our social relations.

Again, we are told that the objection which rests on the fact that the hands of women are already full with domestic duties does not apply to the large (at present unduly large) proportion of single women, who for the purposes of argument are often assumed to have no share in such duties. Those of us who occupy that position well know how far this is from being the case, even during the existence of the present excess of the female population (soon, we must hope, to be reduced for the benefit of the colonies). In almost every home in the country, in every school, and every hospital, and every poverty-stricken district, there is work for single women, and the difficulty even now is to find women available for the performance of it. Childless women, of course, have more freedom of choice in the disposal of their time than mothers; but if they are but moderately capable they will find the demands on their time and sympathies often overwhelming. While sickness and sorrow and orphanhood abound amongst us as they do, it can hardly be otherwise.

It is also to be remembered that unmarried women, though many, are yet a minority. It is not easy to ascertain the precise proportion of women who never marry, but it would appear from an observation continued during some months of the deaths of women over thirty, as recorded in the *Times* newspaper, that about three out of four were or had been married. In the wage-earning classes the proportion of confirmed spinsters is probably still smaller. At any rate, the number of women of mature age who have really no domestic duties can never be large enough to alter to any appreciable extent the general truth that women's work, even when professional (as in the case of trained nurses, school-teachers, and matrons of institutions), is still chiefly domestic. Whether it ought to be more or less exclusively so than it is now is a question of far-reaching importance, and well worth our serious consideration. Its bearing upon the question of the suffrage is, perhaps, chiefly indirect. For there is no doubt that almost all women, whether married or single, and whatever their occupation, could find time to record a vote, if that were all, and if it were their duty to do so. The question is whether, without neglecting their own special work, they can have leisure or opportunity for acquiring the familiar knowledge, either of candidates or of measures, which would be needed to give any value to their votes; whether, in short, public affairs are not outside the peculiar province of women, and whether it is best that women should outstep, or remain within, their own peculiar province.

In a certain sense, no doubt, public affairs are the province of us all. There are many questions coming before Parliament on which it would be most desirable that the opinion of wise and experienced women should be heard. If it were within the horizon of practical politics that some women should sit in each House, or that there should be a third House (with or without legislative power) in which

the voice of women could be heard, as that of 'the Church' is heard in Convocation, much would no doubt be gained. In that way a certain feminine tone—by which I mean a tone of comparative tenderness, calmness, and piety, combined with a lively sense of detail—might not ineffectually leaven the deliberations of our representatives. Women, in electing each other, would bring to bear a real discrimination, and such elections could be carried on in modes specially adapted to preserve the essential qualities of womanhood from unfavourable influences.

But this is not what seems to be now in contemplation. The object of the present agitation seems to be to obliterate for electioneering purposes the distinction of sex, while maintaining it as regards the members elected, and so to plunge women into the struggles of an ordinary election, merely that their votes may be given in favour of one man rather than another. This process appears to be doubly wasteful. No one can be sure what would be its effect on the House of Commons. The candidates chosen by men and women jointly might be pledged to a rather different set of measures from those now demanded of them; or the relative importance of certain measures might be in some degree altered; but the representatives chosen would still be men, and as such entirely incompetent to represent the woman's view of affairs. I am not undervaluing the importance of that view. My contention rather is that the proposed change would fail to give effect to it, and would, at the same time, tend to hinder its present effectiveness, as conveyed through its natural channels of gentle home influence and personal authority over the consciences and convictions of men.

It is certainly not in the interests of either sex alone that this question should be considered. Nor can the demand for the extension of the suffrage to women be rightly described as a claim made by 'woman.' Not only do many women utterly refuse to acknowledge as their representatives those who are now making that demand, but these silent opponents feel that it is a claim *on* women rather than *for* women which is under consideration. The use of the word 'enfranchisement' as equivalent to voting power appears to be full of misleading associations. To have a voice in electing members of Parliament is, no doubt, to have a minute fragment of political power. But this is a very different thing from freedom. It seems to me very doubtful whether the personal freedom of women would, on the whole, be increased by the possession of such power.

Anything like rivalry or jealousy between the sexes is too odious a thought to be dwelt on. But it seems necessary to remember that, were it possible for any such opposition to arise, women must of necessity fail. Our strength lies not in our power to oppose, but in our appeal to all that is best and tenderest in men—in our possession of a key to their reverence. If there be any method by which we can

really help them more fully, either in private or in public life, every true woman will rejoice to use it. But the suffrage can never have any other value or importance than as it may help or hinder the united and harmonious action of the nation as a whole. It is a means to an end, not a thing precious in itself.

What we therefore have to consider is a deeper and larger question than that of our electoral machinery. It is what adjustment of offices and burdens, as between men and women, will most effectually promote the harmonious and energetic working of our national institutions, and the purification and elevation of our national life, both in public and in private.

To whatever extent it may be possible, by changes in our organisation and in our accepted ideals, to assimilate the functions of the two sexes, to that extent, of course, the advantage of variety is sacrificed. If women are to be encouraged to spend their lives, so far as Nature allows, as men spend theirs, the special value and virtue of womanliness will be lost; and the contribution of women to the general stock will to that extent be merely a numerical increase, not an enrichment of quality.

This change, which would in my judgment be a disastrous one, is happily limited, not only by immemorial custom, but in the last resort by unalterable conditions; but it is not so limited as that there is nothing risked by the attempt to approach, or even to push forward, the limit. The extension of the suffrage to women might not by itself greatly lessen the distinctness of the present division of human affairs into separate provinces; but as the symbol and instrument of what is called 'emancipation' it would unquestionably tend in that direction. And we are bound to consider seriously how far we are right in pursuing the policy of effacing or ignoring the distinctions of sex. To say that this policy has gone far enough is not to cast any doubt on its having been right to pursue it up to a certain point. It does not follow, because a certain process has been beneficial in a particular case and a moderate degree, that it must be desirable to push it in all cases to the utmost extreme.

The real question, then, is whether our country will be best served by a continuation of the present immemorial distribution of functions, by which men undertake the actual management of what are emphatically called public affairs, while women are mainly occupied with private or domestic matters, each sex exercising the while a powerful influence on the way in which the other manages its own special business; or whether it would be a better plan that both sexes should indiscriminately attend to all business, whether public or private.

There is a certain absurdity about the mere suggestion of men's taking any increased part in women's work, which seems to show the inherent one-sidedness or unfairness of the suggested alteration.

What is, in fact, proposed is that women, while continuing to do all their own work, shall take an increased share in that of men—or, if the expression be preferred, in that which is open to both men and women. The obvious result would be that the work which women only can do must be increasingly neglected. How much and how grievously it is already neglected is too clear from the terrible statistics of infant mortality, and probably also from the evidence of physical degeneration in adults. The health and vigour of the nation are at the present time too obviously suffering from the extent to which, in the wage-earning classes, at any rate, women have become bread-winners.[1] I do not, of course, mean that this is the only cause of the evils in question, but that it is one of their main causes can, I think, hardly be denied. Whatever tends to throw on women more than their natural share of the burdens and struggles of life must act unfavourably upon the children.

I know that this and other kindred evils are very naturally brought forward as showing the need of more feminine and motherly influences on public affairs. As to the need of such influence I most earnestly agree. It is the very ground of my whole protest; for if women are to exercise it they must before all things remain feminine and motherly. Call them away from home—from their own comparatively limited but (perhaps for that very reason) deeper and more lasting range of influence, into the wider arena of political strife and of the multifarious daily business of the outer world—and you may find that you have forfeited the very qualities of which you were in search; or, rather, you may gravely impair that which, thank Heaven, can never be entirely forfeited.

For what is it that makes or keeps women feminine and motherly? Why do we expect to find in women a tenderness, a gentleness, and a detailed consideration and understanding of the needs and sufferings of others, along with a rapidity and sureness of instinctive judgment and a delicate sense of moral fitness, not to be found in anything like the same degree in men of the same social position and opportunities? Because they are born so, will be the reply of most people. Largely, no doubt, the difference is innate, and depends upon conditions beyond our ken or control. To that extent I thankfully believe it to be indestructible. But we want, for the purification and elevation of our national life and action, not the irreducible minimum of womanliness. We desire, not the lowest, but the highest and purest type of womanhood to be preserved and perpetuated amongst us. Who can doubt that this depends largely upon social and educational influences, and upon the nature of the feminine ideal we accept as distinct from, and complementary to, the masculine ideal?

The purest and noblest type of womanhood is assuredly—and

[1] No one who has worked among the poor can have failed to notice the discreditable readiness of many men to live upon the earnings of their wives.

this is what, I fear, we are in some danger of forgetting—largely developed by the experiences and habits of motherhood and sisterhood, whether actual or ideal. That is to say, women are, or have been, from their childhood trained to bestow a very large proportion of their time and attention upon the art of family life. From the doll stage onwards the habit of watching over and cherishing the helpless, and especially the suffering, is exercised and encouraged. As long as the lot of wife and mother—or, as an alternative, that of Sister of Charity and Mother in Israel—was regarded as the ideal destiny for women generally, the virtues of patient, self-forgetful devotion and tenderness, with all the accompanying qualities which we call specially womanly, were fostered by every surrounding influence. But it is idle to suppose that these qualities will flourish equally well in an atmosphere of ambition for success in professional or political careers. Dare we say even now that there is no falling off in the appreciation by girls of the beautiful possibilities of domestic life? Can we honestly say that the free and applauded entrance of women on careers more or less public has not lessened their readiness to undertake the heavy, though precious, burdens of maternity?

If it be true, as we can scarcely doubt, that some such grievous perversion of natural feeling is going on, the causes of it must certainly be far deeper and wider than can be reached by any electoral arrangements. But the existence of a serious danger is reason enough for avoiding everything which may in even a slight degree tend to aggravate it, and this particular danger must obviously be increased by whatever tends to exalt political and public careers in the estimation of women as compared with the exercise of motherly and specially feminine influences.

It is not from any wish to exclude women from taking their share in public life that we dread the suffrage. We desire, while preserving the old domestic ideal, to extend its action beyond the narrow limits of particular families, and beyond the actual relation of parent and child, so as to purify and elevate the whole of our national action through its influence—*by its own methods*. To this end our first care must be to see that girls shall still be trained to motherliness from infancy, and that all our expanding views of education, all our modern facilities for extending it, shall be regulated by this distinct aim. Maternal instincts may, indeed, be innate in all good women, but it does not follow that their right development is independent of training. Appreciation and admiration alone are not sufficient to preserve them. The art of family life, like all other arts, needs steady practice and study. It consists in the continual application to all the details of daily home life of those principles of goodness, beauty, and truth which underlie all right action, but the working of which, by continual practice in 'that which is least,' comes to be more instinctively recognised, if less intellectually grasped, by the half of

humanity whose duties lie nearest at hand, and in whom the sense of duty has a more or less conscious root in physical instincts. It does not seem possible to cultivate merely intellectual faculties to the utmost without in some degree sacrificing the swiftness and clearness of moral instincts. At any rate, the womanly gift of instantaneous moral judgment must greatly result from the fact that in family life observation, quickened by affection, supplies so much practice in the rapid and almost unconscious application of ethical standards, apart from the slower process of reasoning out the connection between welfare and virtue. That slower process is doubtless quite as important as instinctive judgment, and, indeed, is indispensable as a support and corrective to it. My point is that if we begin to aim at qualifying women to take a share in public life on the same level with men, not to say—which Heaven forbid!—in opposition to or rivalry with them, we shall run a serious risk of blunting the weapon with which a more domestic training so wonderfully furnishes them, for promptly dividing truth from error, reality from pretence, purity of motive from self-seeking, however plausible or disguised. By the keenness and especially the detachment of feminine judgment many a man is kept from sinking to the level of worldly or professional or business codes of conventional morality. While home is a sanctuary, the world of business and politics is continually open to a purifying and elevating influence. I thankfully believe that this influence can never be wholly lost. I gravely fear that it may be lowered by the throwing down of all protecting barriers between women and the rough outer world.

The sanctuary which every rightly ordered home must be is not a mere school of housekeeping and ornament, but a centre of calmness and peace, from which the greatest and deepest as well as the minutest things of life wear an aspect not less but more impressive than they can have in the market or the street. I would have women, to the extent of their ability, study and form a deliberate judgment upon the concerns of their country and of the world at large. If their sheltered position as home-builders naturally prevents their becoming familiar with the precise working of political machinery, their view of the goal to be aimed at may be all the more distinct. From their bird's-eye point of view the end may be kept well in sight, while the means by which it is to be worked out are chiefly left to the men who are in the thick of the battle. From such a central but retired position—'true to the kindred points of heaven and home'—may radiate influences far stronger as well as purer than could ever be exercised by comrades in the field. Where all are striving, none can be umpire. I would have an Egeria in every house to act not only as inspirer, but as moderator and guide of the patriotic zeal of the men whose hearts, after all, she holds in her hands.

We cannot eat our cake and have it. The world will move, and in striving for new virtues and new powers for good some of the old defences must, I readily acknowledge, be left behind. Yet no one will deny that the process, however beneficial, is a dangerous one. It may be that my apprehensions are exaggerated; it may be that there are real needs, imperfectly visible to my eyes, for some further alteration of our traditional balance and adjustment of functions as between men and women. It may be that the gains of such readjustment will outweigh the losses, and that new virtues may be developed by it without serious injury to the old loveliness of life. But it cannot be right that such readjustment should be made or stimulated on any but the broadest grounds of national expediency, or without the hearty concurrence of the half of the nation most immediately concerned.

CAROLINE E. STEPHEN.

AN ATTEMPT TO REVIVE THE DRAMATIC HABIT

A BRIGHT October morning with a touch of hoar-frost on the trees, only just beginning to don the livery of their autumn sleep, and there in the Abbey of Westminster, at the foot of Henry the Fifth's tomb, four red roses and a card—'In Memory of Agincourt.' Again, a month later, a wintry November evening, dimly outlined in the gathering shadows of the smoke and fog—three women praying at the shrine of the Confessor, on St. Edward's Day. Once more, a summer afternoon in a provincial town of England, after a matinée of one of Shakespeare's historical plays, I overheard an old countryman addressing the manager: 'God bless you, sir, for showing us them 'istory plays; they have taught me 'ow we English became what we are and 'ow we can keep so.'

These are but few of the many incidents that point to the awakening of the people to a larger view of the possibilities of our national life. That awakening seems to seek expression in the desire to render service to Britain, whether in the sphere of art or of literature, or of national defence. As an incentive to such service there seems a growing desire on the part of the people to listen once more to the stories our fathers have told us, of wisdom in council and mighty deeds in war.

In conjunction with this national feeling comes the craving of the artist to connect his work with the traditions of a time when ugliness in our towns was the exception and not the rule. In the words of Ruskin and of Morris, the Renaissance of art in England, which seems about to come upon us, is springing partly from a recognition of the necessity of taking up the story of the wonder and the beauty of life where our fathers left off. Our system of education has to learn the limitation of the term 'utility,' that the measure of a thing's value is not solely how much money can be got out of it.

Drama, of all the arts, is in a sense the most obviously national and popular, as a means for expressing the thoughts and feelings, the hopes and aspirations of all classes of the community. It borrows from all the other arts, and therefore can stimulate and arouse interests

among those who have forgotten them; in a word, 'In the theatre there lies the spiritual seed and kernel of all national poetic and all national ethical culture. No other branch can ever truly flourish, or ever aid in cultivating the folk, until the theatre's all-powerful assistance has been completely recognised and guaranteed.' I propose to deal with the work which the Dramatic Revival Society has set before it, from three points of view :

(1) In its relation to the country districts and the towns.

(2) In its relation to schools, as a once popular but now neglected means of education.

(3) In its relation to the religious life of the community.

(1) A large portion of our heroic deeds owe their greatness to the strong 'yeoman life' of England, to the inspiration we have drawn from our mother earth.

Our poetry, our history, our art, our literature, and our laws speak of a time when Nature and her many voices could be heard in the Council Chamber and in the cottage. We are not therefore surprised that it is to the country districts that we have to look chiefly for the survivals of our folk-drama.

From a revival of this dramatic habit, once truly national, may come the means of relieving much of the dulness of our rural life. From the pageant, the local play, folk song and dance, will be supplied the intellectual stimulus which was once provided by the monastic plays, by the wandering companies of actors and of mummers, and in earlier times by the harpist, the minstrel, the bard, the jongleur, and the Anglo-Saxon gleeman.

The dramatic instinct of the people survives in the children's games, such as 'King of the Castle,' &c., and in 'Punch and Judy,' the 'Christmas Mummers,' the 'Lord Mayor's Show' and the like. It may be of interest to quote some passages from the performance of the Mummers. Their stock play is given in much the same form in various districts extending from Sutherlandshire to the Isle of Wight.

In comes I, old Father Christmas,
Christmas or Christmas not,
But I hope old Father Christmas
Will never be forgot!

In comes I, King George o' England,
That man of courage bold,
And with my broadsword in my hand
I won ten thousand pounds in gold.
'Twas I that fought the fiery Dragon
And brought him to his slaughter,
And by these means I won the King of Egypt's daughter.

In I comes, the Turkish Knight
Comes from the Turkish lands to fight.

Pardon me, King George, I will pay,
But never will I be thy slave.

O King, O King, what hast thou done?
I believe thou hast killed my only son.

.

In I come, a very good Doctor,
I've travelled in Italy, Sicily, France, and Spain,
And now I've come back to old England again.
I can cure itch, stitch, palsy, and gout,
If the old Devil's in 'un, I'll soon vetch 'un out.

I kicked her one hundred and ninety-nine miles
Through the eye of a needle into a yawnyard,
Where the wind never blew and the cocks never crew,
And the mice ran about on tiptoe, afraid of being watched.

.

God bless the lady of this house with the gold chain round her neck.

Their paper rosettes, streamers of various colours, and conical headgear might owe their origin to an Etruscan, Assyrian, Byzantine, Anglo-Saxon, or Henry the Fifth fashion. The words savour curiously of the Druid, Robin Hood, Arthur, the early Church and the Crusades, and in some modern degenerate versions, of music-halls and quack medicines.

Besides these faint echoes of an older day, in the last few years there has been a marked increase of activity in the sphere of folk-drama. The peasant of the South, we are told by those who know him best, unlike the Scot, though he will not walk ten yards to a library, will gladly trudge ten miles to a theatre or a 'horsemanship.' The Pageants of Ripon, Flint, Shrewsbury, Sherborne, and Warwick were but the precursors of Bury, Winchester, Romsey and many others. The Grasmere and Hildenborough plays find their counterpart in similar performances at Abington, Coldstream, Newark, and in Norfolk, Devonshire, Berkshire, Gloucester, Yorkshire, and elsewhere.

At Alvechurch for twenty-five years has existed a Shakespeare Society originally instituted by the Vicar, Archdeacon Walters, and now carried on by his successor, Bishop Mylne. The low comedian of their company, a hale and cheery old man of sixty-five, is the plumber and bricklayer of the community. On being asked when he found time to study such parts as Bottom the weaver, Dogberry and the like, he said, 'Just when I am at my work, mending a drain, tiling a house, or building a wall.' 'Eh,' said another member of the company, 'and 'e do build the best walls in Worcestershire, that 'e do.'

In a small Berkshire village, the story of the River Kennet and of the River Isis has been daintily told by the village children, coached by the Squire's wife, in terms of local poetry, local music, interspersed with passages of Browning and of Tennyson. At

Stratford-on-Avon, the Masque, the Morris Dance, the Singing Pilgrims, the flower procession add their quota of enjoyment to the celebration of the yearly Shakespearean festival. These are but a few instances of the reviving tendencies of the rural districts to find recreation and instruction in some form of dramatic representation.

It is interesting to note how Morris Dancing, which was for a long time preserved in its best form in only one or two places in England, notably in the neighbourhood of Crewe and of Ettington, has taken root, under the guidance of Mr. Cecil Sharp, in the East End of London. To such an extent is this the case that many of the villages are applying to the East End for instructors in this rural art.

For the big towns, it is obvious that Drama remains one of the few means of lifting its toilers for a moment beyond this ignorant present; the only means, for many, of showing them any beauty, of giving them any sensation, beyond that experienced in a public-house or at a street fight. Many look forward, in the near future, to folk-song, folk-drama, and folk-dance figuring largely in the programme of the music-hall, when that necessary institution has shaken off the trammels and restrictions of what some think a selfish and shortsighted legislation.

(2) In its relation to education. On the value of drama as a means of general education there is no need to enlarge. The attendance of schools at theatres; the almost universal fashion of a school performance once a year, such as the Shakespeare plays of Ellesmere, Sedbergh, Denstone, Manchester Grammar School, Birmingham Technical School, and in old days at Winchester, the Latin play of Westminster, and the Greek plays of Oxford and Cambridge are acknowledgments of this, but it is more with the use of drama as teaching some special subject that I wish to deal here. Most teachers are agreed in their preference for the concrete instruction rather than the abstract. The picture, though not so popular in this country as in Germany, is largely made use of. The monks and other educationalists were fully aware in mediæval times of the value of the dramatic picture. This value is, however, only appreciated in England by a few teachers of to-day; those who have tried it are unanimous in praise of the results thereby attained. Once when staying in a small village I happened to inquire what on earth the noise, crowd, and clamour in a neighbouring field portended. I was informed that this was the day on which a celebrated 'coach' taught his army pupils Roman history, and presently as my ear became accustomed to the din, cries for Rome and for the Volscians, shouts for Caius Marcius and for Aufidius became distinguishable. At first I was informed that parents objected to the damage done to their boys' clothes. Hannibal's coat was rent in twain at the battle of Cannæ, the leg of Scipio Africanus was broken at Zama, but as they both passed high up into Sandhurst these accidents were overlooked.

Only the other day in Sussex, one of the supporters of the Dramatic Revival Society, on visiting a school and asking what the children knew of Richard the Second, had the following experience: 'I am Bolingbroke,' said one; 'I am Wat Tyler' said another; 'We are Richard the Second because he is so long,' cried two in a breath, and forthwith they proceeded to enact the story of his life. The schoolmistress informed my friend that the children not only learned quicker, but remembered longer the lessons taught them in this way; that the clever children had become much keener, that the dunces on whom all teaching seemed thrown away had at last begun to learn; and that the parents of the children so far shared the enthusiasm as to borrow all her history books in order to be able to participate in the joyous tasks of the little ones. This lady used the method in many branches of study. North America, in the geography lesson, was associated with Red Indians and tomahawks, and pleasant games on the warpath. I do not know whether it had reached as far as scalps, and I believe there was some confusion as to the llamas of South America, that spit at you when you feed them, and the Lamas of Thibet, but in spite of these drawbacks and in spite of opposition at first both from the parents and from the authorities, the system has been adhered to, and has given the greatest satisfaction to the pupils and to the Inspector.

To conclude this part of the subject, many a scholar has been heard to say that he did not understand what a Greek play meant until he saw it acted on the stage; he had not understood its relation to the religious and political life of Greece, or the pregnant meaning of its message to the life of to-day. Even a University bootmaker has been known to come out from one of the performances, declaring that he had at last acquired a respect for alpha, beta, gamma, delta, and what comes of it.

(3) 'Mother, get up; why are you kneeling? People are leaving the theatre.' 'I am sorry, dear; I thought I was in church.' So spoke an elderly Quaker lady, who had come in eight miles from the country to see a Shakespearean play, and who had never been inside a theatre before. The dominant impression after seeing *Hamlet* was that she had been present at some sort of religious ceremony.

The same feeling has often been noticed amongst audiences at the Greek plays, Mysteries and Moralities; in fact, wherever the translation or transfiguration of self to a higher plane has called forth the words, 'It is good for us to be here.' Markedly was this the case at the performance of the Chester plays and at the presentation of *Everyman*. The reverent silence of the onlookers showed the sincerity of their appreciation. One realised the relation of the mystery plays to mediæval England; one felt how much literature and drama had lost by having allowed this particular form of thought-expression to fall into disuse. How much the priests of all religions

have depended on these feelings for the dissemination of their various doctrines and the inculcation of moral truths is well known to the student of Greek, Catholic, and Buddhist history.

It is generally found in these undertakings that all differences are laid aside; the Roman Catholic, the Wesleyan, and the Anglican all work side by side at the Mystery, Morality, or fairy story dealt with in 'our play.' The dramatic representations of 'The Pilgrim's Progress' or of the Nativity have brought to many a parish and village a Christmas message of peace and good will.

There is not space in the limits of an article like this to deal at length with the machinery which the Dramatic Revival Society can employ to meet the needs of these various movements, but it is held that the mere establishment of a central office, for recording what has been done and is still doing amongst us, may be of great service to those villages and parishes that have any story they wish to tell in dramatic form. Such an office has enabled us to give information to many schools and societies as to the staging of various plays, what music, scenery, costumes, acting versions &c. to use. Again, many plays are sent to us, varying from the simple Socratic dialogue to complex conversations between all the Gods and Demigods of Greece and Rome. Only the other day we sent down to a school an adaptation from Herodotus of the death of Crœsus. Similar adaptations from Froissart, Molière, and from our master novelists and many other sources reach our office, and are handed on to those who may require them. The same post brought us in a demand for a play on a Missionary subject, and a copy of a small play on St. Augustine. Some plays that reach us are suitable in form and style for the requirements of the professional theatre; these we read and send on to members of our Society likely to need them, or to aid in their production. From our library and the designs we hope to accumulate, our members will be able to obtain all the information they may require for producing their own work in their own way.

We do not pretend that the Grasmere or Hildenborough players may have any need of our Society's help, but we believe that our members can learn much from such Societies for the promotion of the movement which the Dramatic Revival Society has at heart.

We have established, or are in course of establishing, friendly relations with Miss Mouillot's Amateur Players' Association, Mr. Sharp and Mr. Gardiner's Folk-song and Folk-dance movement, and with Mr. Blunt, of the Peasant Art Society; also with Mrs. Gomme and the Old English Pastime and Children's Game Society. We do not know that we shall be of much help to them, but we think they will be glad to see the result of their efforts made practically useful in the village pageant and village drama.

In conclusion, I have, I hope, however cursorily and inadequately, given some information as to the field of our labours, and the method

we shall employ in ploughing our not lonely furrow. I have shown how our work is in some way, in however humble a degree, in harmony with the cry of 'Back to the land,' and the Garden City; how it may brighten the life of the labourer and make his labour more intelligent and more effective; how it may aid in the renaissance of the arts which seems to be about to dawn upon us, by laying the foundation of a truly National Art, in the re-establishment of folk-drama. No art can be truly national unless it has such a foundation. A great artist whom we invited to join us wrote back, 'Certainly, art, drama, and conscription, more than anything else, will civilise our Empire.' It is in this spirit that our task is undertaken, not for the purpose of making a good labourer into a bad actor, but in the hope of refining some of his amusements, and suggesting to him new forms of recreation and intellectual pleasure.

England possesses a great storehouse of this kind in the shape of dances, songs, and plays, and they are so often left on the shelf undusted and forgotten.

By telling the story that our fathers have told us of England's greatness and gladness, we shall do something to make life more joyous, wiser and richer, for town and village. In so doing we shall assist many problems, not directly our own, such as that of self-defence and the revival of agriculture. In a word, we too are seeking to take part in the movement that is all around us for the re-awakening of England.

Whether the name be well chosen or not, the objects of the Society can surely do something to make the tradition of 'Merrie England' a reality, by song and by dance, by tableau, by drama, by recitation, by pageant, by mystery or fairy play. We can do something to help the people to realise the joy and the sorrow of their own lives and of others. In showing them a ready form for the expression of these emotions, we shall increase the one and lessen or console the other. We shall as a nation again realise what every nation at its greatest holds ever before it—that human progress is realised, according to God's providence, in terms of immortal happiness or immortal pain.

FRANK R. BENSON.

IBSEN'S 'IMPERIALISM

It is said that Henrik Ibsen, even towards the end of his life, regarded *Emperor and Galilean, a World-historic Drama*, as his masterpiece; and, whether this be so or no, there is ample evidence in his letters that at the date of its completion (1873) he held that opinion. I doubt whether any critic of repute has ever been found to agree with him. It has been recognised from the outset that, while the First Part of the great double drama is full of vigour, colour, and movement, the Second Part is languid, fragmentary, and more like a rather long-drawn historical romance than a drama properly so called. Even in the Second Part there are magnificent patches of imaginative work; but the general effect is one of effort, and effort of a rather cheap kind. We feel that, while the play is not very dramatic, it is distinctly and insistently melodramatic.

An examination of its development in the poet's mind, and of its relation to its historic sources, reveals a curious reason for this difference in style and effect between the two parts. In the following pages I shall attempt to show that, just as he was about midway in its composition, Ibsen was seized and mastered by a 'world-historic' idea which impelled him, in the Second Part, if not to alter his view of the character of his hero, at any rate to belittle him by treating him as the pitifully purblind instrument of an overruling destiny. This idea, as I understand it, was a sort of imperialism—a belief in the efficacy of large political or racial aggregates in promoting that 'revolution of the spirit of man' to which he looked for the salvation of the world. That this idea was very clearly thought out, or that it was successfully brought into harmony with his other ideas, I do not contend. But we have the plainest evidence for the fact that it took hold on him, and dominated his thought, during the years when he was giving its final form to *Emperor and Galilean*.

The play was conceived during the first months of Ibsen's first residence in Italy, in 1864; but it was put aside for six years, while he wrote *Brand*, *Peer Gynt*, and *The League of Youth*. In the autumn of 1870, while living in Dresden, he seriously attacked the theme, and on the 18th of January, 1871, he wrote to his publisher, Hegel, that the First Part was finished. But this 'First Part' was not the

five-act play we now possess, under the title of *Cæsar's Apostasy*. At that time he thought of making a trilogy of the work; and the First Part referred to in this letter to Hegel was a three-act play entitled *Julian and the Philosophers*. No doubt it substantially corresponded with the first three acts of *Cæsar's Apostasy*, and ended with Julian's elevation to the rank of Cæsar. At that time (January 1871) the poet hoped to have the whole play ready for the printers by June. As a matter of fact, he took more than two years over what he expected to complete in six months. In July 1871 he wrote to Hegel, asking for more historical documents as to the career of Julian—'It is facts that I require.' At the same time he said: 'This book will be my chief work. . . . That positive view of the world which the critics have so long been demanding of me they will find here.' Up to August of the following year (1872) he still wrote of the play as being divided into three parts: *Julian and the Philosophers*, three acts; *Julian's Apostasy*, three acts; and *Julian on the Imperial Throne*, five acts. It is not clear at what date he determined to fuse the six acts of the first two plays into the five acts of the play we actually possess. The announcement of this alteration first occurs in a letter to Hegel, of February 1873, informing him of the completion of the whole work.

It was in 1872 that Ibsen made, by correspondence, the acquaintance of Mr. Edmund Gosse; and to him he wrote in October of that year:

> I am working daily at *Julianus Apostata*, and . . . am putting into this book a great part of my own spiritual life. What I depict I have, under other forms, myself gone through; and the historic theme I have chosen has also a much closer relation to the movements of our own time than one might at first suppose.

In a somewhat later letter to Mr. Gosse, he says: 'I have kept strictly to history . . . and yet I have put much self-anatomy into this book.' In the same key he wrote to his friend Ludvig Daae immediately after the completion of the play: 'There is in the character of Julian . . . more of my own spiritual experience than I care to acknowledge to the public.'

Now let us note the exact day on which Ibsen told Hegel that *Julian and the Philosophers* was completed, that he was hard at work on the Second Part, and that he hoped to have all three parts finished in six months. The day was the 18th of January, 1871—the very day on which, at Versailles, King William of Prussia was proclaimed German Emperor. That this event, and all that it stood for, made a deep impression on Ibsen, we know on his own authority. In 1888 he wrote to the Danish-German scholar Julius Hoffory:

> *Emperor and Galilean* is not the first work I wrote in Germany, but doubtless the first that I wrote under the influence of German spiritual life. . . .

During my four years' stay in Rome I had merely made various historical studies and taken sundry notes for *Emperor and Galilean*. I had not sketched out any definite plan, and much less written any of it. My view of life was still, at that time, national Scandinavian, wherefore I could not master the foreign material. Then, in Germany, I lived through the great time, the year of the war and the development which followed it. This brought with it for me, at many points, an impulse of transformation. My conception of world history and of human life had hitherto been a national one. It now widened into a racial conception, and then I could write *Emperor and Galilean*.

This puts it beyond doubt that a marked change of mental attitude must have occurred during the actual composition of the play. We know that before the day on which the imperialisation of Germany became an accomplished fact—and therefore long before it was possible for the poet to realise and take home to himself the historic lessons of that event—the three acts of *Julian and the Philosophers* were already written, and good progress made with *Julian's Apostasy*. But when we next hear of the play, six months later, we find that, far from being finished, it has apparently made little or no advance. What has he been doing in the interval? He has been, I suggest, readjusting his mental attitude in the light of the 'world-historic' events of which he is an absorbed spectator.

In a letter to Hegel he speaks explicitly of 'the growth of the idea during the process of composition.' At the end of the six months of apparent inactivity we find him calling out (rather late in the day, one would think) for facts. The inference is that hitherto he has been poetising more or less freely on a comparatively slight historic basis, but that his new idea involves a closer sifting of the documents. And this inference is fully borne out by a study of the play in its relation to history. To put it broadly, but not, I think, unfairly: the First Part (as it now stands) is true to the spirit of history, but not to the letter, while the Second Part is true to the letter, but not to the spirit. For the actual events, the individual scenes, of the First Part, there is no historic foundation, except in the case of the military insurrection which forced Julian to assume the purple. Apart from some unimportant rearrangements of chronology, the other events are such as may quite well have occurred, but there is no evidence that they did actually occur. When we pass to the Second Part, on the other hand, we find it a mere mosaic of incidents and expressions taken bodily from the documents. Here there is practically nothing fictitious save the fictions of the ecclesiastical historians. Yet the general impression conveyed by the Second Part is as false to history and unjust to Julian as the general impression conveyed by the First Part is just and true.

In saying this, however, I am somewhat anticipating my argument. All I have hitherto proved is that between January and *June 1871—that is to say, between the practical completion of our* present First Part and the commencement of the Second Part—

a momentous change of spirit and of method did as a matter of fact take place. The First Part, no doubt, would afterwards be in some degree modified in the light of later conceptions; but the changes were certainly not sufficient to obscure the spirit in which it was originally conceived, or to render it homogeneous with the Second.

It is to be noted that not until after the six months' gap between January and July 1871 does Ibsen announce to Hegel that the play will contain 'that positive view of the world which the critics have so long been demanding.' What, then, was that 'positive view'? It can have been nothing else than the theory of the 'third empire' which is to absorb both paganism and Christianity, and is to mark, as it were, the maturity of the race, in contrast to its pagan childhood and its Christian adolescence. The theory is most clearly formulated in the scene between Julian and Maximus at the end of the third act of the Second Part, of which this is the essential portion:

JULIAN. Who shall conquer? The Emperor or the Galilean?

MAXIMUS. Both the Emperor and the Galilean shall succumb.

JULIAN. Succumb——? Both——? . . .

MAXIMUS. Hear me, brother and friend of truth! I say you shall both succumb— but not that you shall perish.

Does not the child succumb in the youth, and the youth in the man? Yet neither child nor youth perishes.

Oh, my best-loved pupil—have you forgotten our colloquies in Ephesus about the three empires?

JULIAN. Ah, Maximus, years have passed since then. Speak!

MAXIMUS. You know I have never approved your policy as Emperor. You have tried to make the youth a child again. The empire of the flesh is swallowed up in the empire of the spirit. But the empire of the spirit is not final, any more than the youth is. You have tried to hinder the growth of the youth, to hinder him from becoming a man. Oh, fool, who have drawn your sword against that which is to be—against the third empire, in which the twin-natured shall reign!

That this conception was no passing one, but was fundamental with Ibsen, is proved in many ways, but chiefly, perhaps, in a speech he delivered in Stockholm in 1887, fourteen years after the completion of *Emperor and Galilean*, in which he said:

I have sometimes been called a pessimist; and, indeed, I am one, inasmuch as I do not believe in the eternity of human ideals. But I am also an optimist, inasmuch as I fully and confidently believe in the ideals' power of propagation and of development. Especially and definitely do I believe that the ideals of our time, as they pass away, are tending toward that which, in my drama of *Emperor and Galilean*, I have designated as 'the third empire.' Let me therefore drain my glass to the growing, the coming time.

The analogy between this theory and the Nietzschean conception of the 'Overman' need not here be emphasised. It is sufficient to note that Ibsen had come to conceive world-history as moving under the guidance of a Will which works through blinded, erring and

sacrificed human instruments, toward a 'third empire' in which the jarring elements of flesh and spirit shall be reconciled.

It may seem like a play on the word 'empire' to connect this concept with the establishment in January 1871 of a political confederation of petty States, compared with which even Julian's 'orbis terrarum' was a world-empire indeed. But there can be no doubt that in Ibsen's mind political unification, the formation of large aggregates inspired by a common idea, figured as a preliminary to the coming of the 'third empire.' Of this there are many evidences. In no other sense can we read the letter to Hoffory above quoted, or the letter to George Brandes in which he says:

> Only entire nations can join in great intellectual movements. A change of front in our conception of life and of the world is no parochial matter, and we Scandinavians have not yet got beyond the parish-council standpoint. Nowhere do you find a parish council anticipating and furthering the third empire.

In a later letter to Brandes (Munich, 30th of October, 1888) he says: 'I began by feeling myself a Norwegian. I then developed into a Scandinavian, and now I have come to rest in collective Germanism.' To the same purpose runs one of his commonplace-book reflections, recently brought to light; it is undated, but was evidently written before 1871: 'We laugh at the four-and-thirty fatherlands of Germany; but the four-and-thirty fatherlands of Europe are equally ridiculous. North America is content with one, or—for the present—with two.' Perhaps it may not be quite fanciful to find an evidence of the persistence of this habit of thought in the fact that the poet's last public utterances should have taken the form of protests against one-sided sympathy with the Boers in the South African war.

'But Julian,' it may be said, 'represented precisely this ideal of political cohesion which was revived in the unification of Germany; why, then, should Ibsen, in writing the second play, have (so to speak) turned against his hero?' Incidentally and by inheritance, Julian did indeed stand for Empire; but that was not the idea which animated his life. What he aimed at was, in effect, the maintenance of unnumbered local cults, in opposition to the spiritual unity which was the ideal, fiercely and intolerantly pursued, of the Christian Church. It was this very claim to universal validity that Julian could least endure in the doctrine of the Galileans. True, he was himself a monotheist in the Neo-Platonic sense. The gods were to him only emanations or symbols—departmental representatives, as it were—of God. This highly compressed statement does great injustice to the subtlety of this metaphysic, but is sufficiently accurate for the present purpose. It is not quite clear to us, and it was very likely not quite clear to Julian himself, whether he believed in the objective existence of the divinities he worshipped. Probably he did not; yet M. Gaston

Boissier, a high authority on such a point, writes : ' Je n'oserais pas dire avec autant d'assurance que M. Naville que l'anthropomorphisme lui est tout à fait étranger.' Be this as it may, he regarded the finite deities of polytheism as indispensable forms through which alone the human mind could contemplate or commune with the infinite ; and he was quite willing that every nation or tribe should approach God through the gods to whom their fathers had paid homage. His own ' Hellenism ' he regarded as a very superior form of religion, but not as exclusively valid. He may have hoped that—with the improvements he sought to introduce into it, most of them borrowed from Christianity—it would ultimately spread even to the barbarians. But his tolerance of barbarian cults (such as the Jewish worship of Jehovah) was not only sincere—it was a fundamental element in his thought. Had Christianity been content to be *a* religion he would have seen no objection to it ; what he would not suffer was its intransigeant claim to be *the* religion. But Ibsen had come to think of this spiritual imperialism as precisely the most necessary step towards the realisation of the ' third empire.' A loose political unity could be of little avail without the spiritual fusion implied in a world-religion. It was Julian's tragic error to oppose this fusion ; or rather, he was chosen as the ' third great freedman under necessity ' to give the final demonstration of the impotence of religious nationalism. Christianity, as it existed in the fourth century, possessed a metaphysic very similar to that of Neo-Platonic polytheism, and certainly in no way inferior ; it possessed a greatly superior ethic ; it opposed to the anarchy of paganism a highly-developed organisation and power of ecclesiastical discipline (both of which Julian attempted to imitate) ; and, above all, it possessed the inestimable advantage of offering for worship no mere symbols or figures of speech, but a historic divinity whose human character, as distinct from his theological functions, was eminently capable of exciting devotion and enthusiasm. That Julian should have set himself up against a religion thus equipped for world-conquest was, in Ibsen's eyes, a crime against the light, but a crime predestined to make the light shine forth the more irresistibly.

Since Julian's failure, however, was the most conspicuous and unalterable fact in the historical data, it may seem that Ibsen must from the outset have intended some such conclusion to his work as that which he actually gave it, and that the events of 1871 can at most have lent greater precision to ideas which must all along have been in his mind. But is this so certain ? Ibsen could not make Julian succeed ; but was it necessary to make him fail so pitiably and almost ignobly ? Or, to bring the matter to a more definite point, is the Julian of the Second Part really the same man as the Julian of the First Part ?

There may, indeed, be no irreconcilable contradiction between

the two phases of Julian's character; yet one cannot but feel, I think, that in the Second Part the poet's attitude towards him has entirely changed. In the First Part he is in the main heroic, with moments of weakness; in the Second Part, he is in the main contemptible, with moments of heroism. The ultimate secret of this change is probably to be sought in Ibsen's repeated assertion, to Mr. Gosse and other correspondents, that he has 'put into the book a part of his own spiritual life,' and that 'there is in the character of Julian more of his own spiritual experience than he cares to acknowledge to the public.'

In what sense can he mean this? Every dramatist, of course, draws upon the potentialities of his own soul for many of the traits which he gives to his characters. Mr. Meredith declared to Robert Louis Stevenson that he found his Sir Willoughby Patterne mainly in his own breast; and similarly Ibsen said that Brand represented the higher side, and Peer Gynt the lower side, of his own nature. That, in this sense, something of Julian came from within, is doubtless true; but as all the leading traits of his character came from without—from history, anecdote, invective, and above all from his own writings—he certainly could not be called a mere self-projection of the poet, as an entirely fictitious personage might be. In this sense, then, Ibsen can scarcely have meant his reiterated remark. Its truth, in this sense, would have been limited and not worth emphasising. What he meant, I suggest, was that he had himself gone through the same rebellion against Christianity—against book-worship, death-worship, other-worldliness, hypocrisy, intolerance—which he has portrayed in Julian. He had seen (in Rome) the ruins of the ancient world of light and glory sicklied o'er with the pale cast of mediævalism; and he had sympathised to the full with Julian's passionate resentment against the creed which had defamed and defaced the old beauty in the name of a truth that was so radically corrupted as to be no longer true. Julian, then, as he first conceived the play, was to be the poet's own mouthpiece (within the limits imposed by his dramatic instinct), and to proclaim unequivocally what Carlyle would have called his 'Exodus from Houndsditch.' He was to fail, indeed; but his failure was to be represented as a world-catastrophe. In the light of this conception, the First Part was planned and in great measure written. But then intervened the new idea, the spiritual imperialism, if I may so express it, arising out of the events of 1870–71. Further study of detail showed that the secret of Julian's failure lay in the hopeless inferiority of the religion he championed to the religion he attacked. That religion, with all its corruptions, came to seem a necessary stage in the evolution of humanity; and the poet asked himself, perhaps, whether he, any more than Julian, had even now a more practical substitute to offer in its place. In the concept of the 'third empire' he found the keystone to his arch of thought, to which

everything else must be brought into due relation. He re-wrote (it seems probable) the scene of the symposium at Ephesus (Part I., Act III.) in order to emphasise this idea; and it entirely dominated and conditioned the whole of the second play.

But what was the effect of this concept? It was to make Julian a plaything in the hands of some power, some implicitly postulated World-Will, working slowly, deviously, but relentlessly towards a far-off, dimly-divined consummation. Christianity, no doubt, was also an instrument of this power; but it was an instrument predestined (for the moment) to honourable uses, while its opponent was fated to dishonour. Thus the process of the Second Part is a gradual sapping of Julian's intelligence and power of moral discrimination; while the World-Will, acting always on the side of Christianity, becomes indistinguishable from the mechanical providence of the vulgar melodramatist.

Whatever we may think of the historical or philosophical value of the theory of the 'third empire,' there can be little doubt that its effect upon the play has been artistically disastrous. It has led Ibsen to cog the dice against Julian in a way from which even a Father of the Church might have shrunk. He has not only accepted uncritically all the invectives of Gregory and the other Christian assailants of 'Antichrist,' but he has given to many historic events a fictitious twist, and always to Julian's disadvantage.

It would need a volume to apply to each incident of the Second Part the test of critical examination. I must be content with a rough outline of the distorting effect of the poet's preoccupation with his 'world-historic' idea.

In the first place, he makes Julian much more of a persecutor than even his enemies allege him to have been. Nothing is more certain than that Julian was sincerely convinced of the inefficacy of violence as a means of conversion, and keenly alive to the impolicy of conferring upon his opponents the distinction of martyrdom. Tried by the standards of his age, he was a marvellously humane man. Compared with his uncle Constantine, his cousin Constantius, and his brother Gallus—to go no further back among wearers of the purple—he seems like a being of another race. It is quite true, as his enemies allege, that his clemency was politic as well as humane; but, whatever its motives, it was real and consistent. Gregory, while trying to make him out a monster, explicitly and repeatedly complains that he denied to Christians the crown of martyrdom. Saint Jerome speaks of his *blanda persecutio*, persecution by methods of mildness. The worst that can be alleged against him is a lack of diligence in punishing popular outrages upon the Christians (generally of the nature of reprisals) which occurred here and there under his rule. That he incited to such riots is nowhere alleged, and it is difficult to judge whether his failure to repress them was due to malicious inertia or to

actual lack of power. The policing of the empire cannot have been an easy matter, and Julian was occupied during the whole of his brief reign in concentrating his forces for the Persian expedition. It cannot be pretended that his tolerance rose to the pitch of impartiality. He favoured pagans, and he more or less oppressed Christians; though a considerable part of his alleged oppression lay in the withdrawal of extravagant privileges conferred on them by his predecessors. In his attempt to undo some of the injustices that Christians had committed during their forty years of predominance—such as the seizure of temple glebes and so forth—he was doubtless guilty, on his own account, of more than one injustice. Wrong breeds wrong, and in a time of religious dissolution and reconstruction equity is always at the mercy of passion, resentment, and greed. There was even, in some of Julian's proceedings, a sort of perfidy and insolence that must have been peculiarly galling to the Christians. It would not be altogether unjust to accuse him of having instituted against the new religion a campaign of chicanery; but that is something wholly different from a campaign of blood. The alleged 'martyrdoms' of his reign are few in number,[1] are, for the most part, recounted by late and prejudiced authorities, are accompanied by all the manifestly fabulous details characteristic of such stories, and are none of them, with the smallest show of credibility, laid to the account of Julian himself.

But what is the impression we receive from Ibsen? We are given to understand that Julian drifted into a campaign of sanguinary atrocity, full of horrors as great as those recorded or imagined of the persecutions under Decius and Diocletian. It is made to seem, moreover, that he was personally concerned in some of the worst of these horrors. We are asked to conceive his life as being passed with the mingled shrieks and psalms of his victims ringing in his ears. He is made to gloat in imagination over their physical agonies. ('Where are the Galileans now? Some under the executioner's hands, others flying through the narrow streets, ashy pale with terror, their eyes starting from their heads,' &c.) He is haunted in his last hours by ghastly visions of whole troops of martyrs. Moreover, his persecutions are made particularly hateful by the fact that they either fall upon or threaten his personal friends. The companion of his childhood, Agathon (a fictitious personage), is goaded by remorseless cruelty to that madness which eventually makes him the assassin of Antichrist. Gregory of Nazianzus is first made (what he never was) Julian's most cherished comrade, and is then shown as doing what he never did—playing a noble and heroic part in personally defying the tyrant. Mad and monstrous designs are attributed to Julian, such as that of searching out (with the aid of tortures) and destroying all the

[1] Between fifteen and twenty are enumerated by Allard (*Julien l'Apostat*), a writer who gravely reproduces all the stereotyped figments of the hagiographers.

writings of the Christians. This trait appears to be suggested by a letter from Julian to the Prefect of Egypt, enjoining him to collect and preserve all the books which had belonged to George, Bishop of Alexandria:

> He had many of them concerning philosophy and rhetoric, and many that contained the doctrines of the impious Galileans. I would willingly see the last-named all destroyed, if I did not fear that some good and useful books might, at the same time, by mistake be destroyed. Make, therefore, the most minute search concerning them. In this search the secretary of George may be of great help to you. . . . But if he try to deceive you in this affair, submit him to the torture.

It is needless to remark upon the difference between a rhetorical wish that all the Christian books in a particular library might be destroyed, and an actual attempt to annihilate all the Christian writings in the world. Thus not only are the clearest evidences of Julian's abstention from violence disregarded, but all sorts of minor incidents are misrepresented to his disadvantage.

A particularly grave injustice to his character meets us almost on the threshold of the Second Part. The execution of the treasurer, Ursulus, by the military tribunal which Julian appointed on coming to the throne is condemned by all historians and was regretted by Julian himself. No doubt he was culpably remiss in not preventing it; but Ibsen, without the slightest warrant, gives his conduct a peculiarly odious character in making it appear that he deliberately sacrificed the old man to his resentment of a blow administered to his vanity in the matter of the Eastern ambassadors. There is nothing whatever to connect Ursulus with this incident.

The failure of Julian's effort to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem is a matter of unquestioned history. It is impossible now to determine, though it is easy to conjecture, what natural accidents were magnified by superstition into supernatural intervention. But what does Ibsen do? He is not even content with the comparatively rational account of the matter given by Gregory within a few months of its occurrence. He adopts Ammian's later and much-exaggerated account; he makes Jovian (who had nothing to do with the affair) avouch it with the authority of an eye-witness; and, to give the miracle a still more purposeful significance, he represents it as the instrument of the conversion of Jovian, who was to be Julian's successor, and the undoer of his work. Under ordinary circumstances, this would be a quite admissible rearrangement of history, designed to save the introduction of another character. But the very fact that the poet is throughout the play so obviously sacrificing dramatic economy and concentration to historic accuracy renders this heightening of the alleged miracle something very like a falsification of evidence. It arises, of course, from no desire to be unjust to Julian, for whom Ibsen's sympathy remains unmistakable, but from a determination to make him the

tragic victim of a World-Will pitilessly using him as an instrument to its far-off ends.

But this conception of a vague external power interfering at all sorts of critical moments to baffle designs which, for one reason or another, it disapproves, belongs to the very essence of melodrama. Therefore the incident of the Temple of Jerusalem brings with it painful associations of *The Sign of the Cross*; and still more suggestive of that masterpiece is the downfall of the temple of Apollo at Daphne, which brings the second act of the Second Part to a close. Here the poet deliberately departs from history for the sake of a theatrical effect. The temple of Apollo was not destroyed by an earthquake, or in any way that even suggested a miracle. It was simply burnt to the ground; and though there was no evidence to show how the conflagration arose, the suspicion that it was the work of Christians cannot be regarded as wholly unreasonable.

An incident of which Ibsen quite uncritically accepts the accounts of Julian's enemies is his edict imposing what we should now call a test on the teachers in public (municipal) schools. This was probably an impolitic act; but an act of frantic tyranny it certainly was not. Homer and Hesiod were in Julian's eyes sacred books. They were the scriptures of his religion; and he decreed that they should not be expounded to children, at the public expense, by 'atheists' who (unless they were hypocrites as well) were bound to cast ridicule and contempt on them as religious documents. It is not as though Christians of that age could possibly have been expected to treat the Olympian divinities with the decent reverence with which even an agnostic teacher of to-day will speak of the gospel story. Such tolerance was foreign to the whole spirit of fourth-century Christianity. It was nothing if not intolerant; and the teacher would have been no good Christian who did not make his lessons the vehicle of proselytism. There is something a little paradoxical in the idea that tolerance should go the length of endowing the propagation of intolerance; and it is sheer absurdity to represent Julian's measure as an attempt to deprive Christians of all instruction, and hurl them back into illiterate barbarism. He explicitly states that Christian children are as welcome as ever to attend the schools.

As the drama draws to a close, Ibsen shows his hero at every step more pitifully hoodwinked and led astray by the remorseless World-Will. He regains, towards the end, a certain tragic dignity, but it is at the expense of his sanity. 'Quos deus vult perdere prius dementat.' Now there is no real evidence for the frenzied megalomania, the *Cäsarenwahn*, which the poet attributes to Julian. It is not even certain that his conduct of the Persian expedition was so rash and desperate as it is represented to have been. Gibbon (no partisan of Julian's) has shown that there is a case to be made even for the burning of the fleet. The mistake, perhaps, lay not so much in burning it as in

having it there at all. Even as events fell out, the result of the expedition was by no means the greatest disaster that ever befell the Roman arms. The commonplace, self-indulgent Jovian brought the army off, ignominiously indeed, but in tolerable preservation. Had Julian lived, who knows but that the burning of the ships might now have ranked as one of the most brilliant inspirations recorded in military history?

It would be too much, perhaps, to expect any poet to resist the introduction of the wholly unhistorical 'I am hammering the Emperor's coffin,' and 'Thou hast conquered, Galilean.' They certainly fell in too aptly with Ibsen's scheme for him to think of weighing their evidences. But one significant instance may be noted of the way in which he twists things to the detriment either of Julian's character or of his sanity. In the second scene of the fifth act, he makes Julian contemplate suicide by drowning, in the hope that, if his body disappeared, the belief would spread abroad that he had been miraculously snatched up into the communion of the gods. Now Gregory, it is true, mentions the design of suicide; but he mentions it as an incident of Julian's delirium *after* his wound. Gregory's virulence of hatred makes him at best a suspected witness; but even he did not hold Julian capable of so mad a fantasy before his intellect had been overthrown by physical suffering and fever.

Thus from step to step, throughout the Second Part, does Ibsen disparage and degrade his hero. It is not for me to discuss the value of the conception of the 'third empire' to which poor Julian was sacrificed. But one thing we may say with confidence—namely, that the postulated World-Will does not work by such extremely melodramatic methods as those which Ibsen attributes to it. So far as its incidents are concerned, the Second Part might have been designed by a superstitious hagiologist, or a melodramatist desirous of currying favour with the clergy. Nay, it might almost seem as though the spirit of Gregory of Nazianzus—himself a dramatist after a fashion—had entered into Ibsen during the composition of the play. Certainly, if the World-Will decreed that Julian should be sacrificed in the cause of the larger Imperialism, it made of Ibsen, too, its instrument for completing the immolation.

WILLIAM ARCHER.

THE BACKGROUND OF DRAMA

I.

In his *Shakespeare and the Modern Stage* Mr. Sidney Lee has dealt in a trenchant style with the elaborate scenic production of Shakespeare's plays which is the fashion of the day. He gives many reasons why scenic display should not be too elaborate, among them the practical one that the cost of such productions is so excessive that two or three pieces could be mounted for the same cost as one. That is a matter which need hardly be discussed, for presumably managers know their own business and do not spend money on their productions unless they have good reason to expect it will be returned to them with profit. The chief practical objection, apart from artistic grounds, against the elaborate productions of to-day, is that the initial expense demands a long run before the manager can be recouped, and long runs do not make for the best achievement of the actor's art. Unfortunately, Shakespeare is not the only sufferer from this state of things, and long runs are not always the result of an expensive production. While the theatre is a commercial speculation, the manager will naturally attempt to squeeze every penny piece he can out of his commodities. The plays themselves suffer. Mr. J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* is an instance. It is now in its third year, and, we may assume, will gradually take its place as a dramatic perennial. It has not been improved in its subsequent growths. The acting has not improved, and all kinds of tasteless 'business' have been grafted on to the original stock. The problem of long runs is very difficult to solve. It is all very well to say that an artistic manager should withdraw a play after a reasonable number of performances, which would be determined both by public demand and the players' interest in their work; but London is so large that, if a play be really successful, it may run for a year without having exhausted its audience. Mr. Pinero's *His House in Order* is a case in point, for that play is not of the type which people desire to see many times, so that every audience is practically a fresh audience. Nor can it be said that Mr. Beerbohm Tree, who is the arch-priest of elaborate Shakespearian productions, keeps any one play on his stage for an exceptionally long run. Whether he changes them for financial reasons or other I do not know, but a

year's history of work at His Majesty's shows sufficient variety. *Much Ado about Nothing*, *The Tempest*, *Business is Business*, *Colonel Newcome* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, besides a Shakespeare week in the summer, is not a bad record for one theatre, and compares favourably with any stage but that of the Court Theatre. The practical side of theatre management is beset with so many difficulties that we had best not touch upon them. The complication of the problem by the magnificence of scenery, upholstery, and costumes supposed to be demanded by modern audiences does not apply to Shakespeare only. It will be more to the purpose to examine the modern decoration of Shakespeare, and scenic elaboration in general, entirely from the artistic standpoint.

II.

There are two opposed views which call for some consideration. Mr. H. Beerbohm Tree, in a lecture to the members of the Salon, thus expressed the faith that is in him :

> I take it that the entire business of the stage is—illusion. To gain this end, all means are fair. The same is sometimes said of love and war, though I incline to dismiss this declaration as an ethical fallacy. Illusion, then, is the first and last word of the stage : all that aids illusion is good, all that destroys illusion is bad. This simple law governs us—or should govern us. In that compound of all the arts which is the art of the modern theatre, the sweet grace of restraint is of course necessary, and the scenic embellishments should not overwhelm the dramatic interest, or the balance is upset—the illusion is gone!

These be wise words, but it will be noted they contain a very drastic modification of the blessings of 'scenic embellishments.'

Mr. Sidney Lee, whose opinions may be taken as representing those of the bulk of literary admirers of Shakespeare, bewails the fact that the imagination of modern audiences is so weak that they cannot create the environment of Shakespeare's dramas for themselves, as audiences did in the poet's day. But Mr. Lee is in favour of adequate scenery. He is not of Mr. Beerbohm Tree's 'certain pedants' who 'apparently imagine that Shakespeare should be presented on the stage of the twentieth century in the same manner and with the same limitations as were necessarily observed on the stage of the Globe Theatre in the sixteenth century.' The general question of the place of scenery in drama is complicated, however, by the loose construction of Shakespeare's plays. Mr. Beerbohm Tree has quoted the chorus which precedes *Henry the Fifth* in support of his contention that Shakespeare did not consider the limited scenic conditions of his own day 'as perennial and eternal' :

> But pardon, gentles all,
> The flat unraised spirit, that hath dar'd,
> On this unworthy scaffold, to bring forth
> So great an object: Can this cockpit hold

The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O, the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
O, pardon! since a crooked figure may
Attest, in little place, a million;
And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
On your imaginary forces work:
Suppose, within the girdle of these walls
Are now confin'd two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous, narrow ocean parts asunder.
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts;
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance:
Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth:
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings,
Carry them here and there; jumping o'er times;
Turning the accomplishment of many years
Into an hour-glass.

Mr. Tree sees in this a prophetic vision and justification of His Majesty's Theatre. Mr. Sidney Lee, on the other hand, considers the lines

a spirited appeal to his audience not to waste regrets on defects of stage machinery, but to bring to the observation of his piece their highest powers of imagination, whereby alone can full justice be done to a majestic theme. The central topic of the choric speech is the essential limitations of all scenic appliances. The dramatist reminds us that the literal presentation of life itself, in all its movement and action, lies outside the range of the stage, especially the movement and action of life in its most glorious manifestations.

If Shakespeare meant that as an æsthetic theory, the less Shakespeare he. A poet who knows that 'the literal presentation of life itself . . lies outside the range of the stage' and yet attempts that presentation, and excuses it in a prologue, merely shows that he has not thought about the theory of drama. And, indeed, the greater part of the speech is a lame excuse for the disregard of dramatic unities which makes Shakespeare's plays so difficult to present on any stage without emphasising their chaos of construction. We really must not account this chaotic chronicling of incidents as a virtue, or even as a magnificent lapse which can be made good by the imagination of an audience. This free-and-easy marshalling of incidents in Shakespeare is a weakness and a sign of drama in a low state of development.

In this respect many of his works are mere chronicle-plays, however magnificent they may be in the higher sense of drama: in their truth to human nature, their presentment of character, and their gorgeous verse. At the same time, although no modern scenic art can amend an essential breach of unities, Mr. Tree is partly right in considering this speech as evidence that Shakespeare could imagine a better

setting for his play than the Globe Theatre was able to give him. 'Into a thousand parts divide one man' plainly cries out for the multitudinous supers of His Majesty's Theatre. Possibly, too, Shakespeare would have liked to see his horses 'printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth,' nor would he have objected to his kings being decked in more dazzling apparel than the thoughts of his audience could supply. In this limited sense the speech is on the side of Mr. Beerbohm Tree. Not all the spectacular ingenuity in the world could, however, make two kingdoms of the 'unworthy scaffold' of the stage. Moreover, if any argument against elaborate scenic productions of Shakespeare were required it is to be found in the very construction of his plays.

III.

We must honestly accept this chaotic presentment of the stories Shakespeare has to tell. We need not pretend, in blind admiration of our great poet, that this chaos is a virtue, or anything more than the natural outcome of theatrical conditions of the poet's period. But it exists in his plays, and no modern manager can artistically pass it over. It should be stated at once, too, that chaotic as the conduct of the dramas may be, the sudden changes of scene, the 'jumping o'er times' and the 'turning the accomplishment of many years into an hour-glass,' are an organic part of them. These cannot be cut out without injuring the main drama and destroying many necessary considerations. The modern manager has to eliminate some of these scenes or to incorporate them with others. The only alternative is the production of Shakespeare's plays as far as possible in the conditions of their original performances.

That our public would not accept them in that guise is not evidence that the popular imagination is less strong than it was in Shakespeare's time. The audience of Shakespeare's day had to exercise rather less imagination than is required for the appreciation of fiction. It is a question of custom. We are accustomed to scenery, and we miss it when it is absent. Moreover, a drama does gain by its scenic environment. The difficulty the manager has to face in mounting Shakespeare is twofold: in the first place he must arrange his settings so that the least possible delay is caused by the change of scene; and, secondly, he should not allow the drama to be obscured by giving too much prominence to its embellishments. The first difficulty used to be overcome by a convenient compromise. By the employment of front scenes the action could pass almost as continuously as in the days of Shakespeare, and the only considerable waits were after each act. Mr. Beerbohm Tree has made an innovation even from Sir Henry Irving's method of producing Shakespeare. At His Majesty's Theatre there is never a front scene in the old sense. The less important scenes are set with an elaboration which certainly makes it necessary to limit

their number as much as possible, both on the score of expense and of time. The consequence is that Shakespeare has to undergo even more reshaping than used to be the case.

The recent revival of *Antony and Cleopatra* is, of course, a glaring example. It is one of Shakespeare's most chaotic plays, and it is difficult to imagine what an Elizabethan audience made of the continual changing of the action from Egypt to Rome and back. I do not believe that the average Elizabethan troubled his mind about it. He was too intent on the characters and the verse, and he was accustomed to take a large fund of make-believe with him to the theatre. The arrangement made for Mr. Tree was very skilful in many ways, but it could not escape certain anomalies, which were made more patent from the fact that at least two scenes had to be omitted at the last moment. This would not have been necessary had the system of front scenes been followed, and had much valuable time not been frittered away in unnecessary illustrations of the text.

It must be confessed that Mr. Tree's grangerisms of Shakespeare are often very ingenious and not wanting in imagination. He presents an *édition de luxe* of the poet, with living pictures. No one can come away from His Majesty's Theatre without having had his pictorial imagination quickened. Every production there is a kind of object-lesson in the splendour of the dead past. But a poet goes behind the show of things; it is his to interpret for us the minds and the hearts of men and women on whom the eternal silence has fallen; to show us how their natures join ours, and how the same sun shone on them as shines on us. This is not to be achieved through tableaux, however magnificent they may be. And this magnificence of illustration does still further make Shakespeare chaotic; for, well managed as it is, such a picture as that which illustrates Cæsar's description of Antony and Cleopatra in Alexandria is unnecessary:

> I' the market-place, on a tribunal silver'd,
> Cleopatra and himself in chairs of gold
> Were publicly enthron'd; at the feet sat
> Cæsarion, whom they call my father's son,
> And all the unlawful issue, that their lust
> Since then hath made between them.

The picture was a splendid example of stage management, and, as one of a series of Shakespearian *tableaux vivants*, would be worthy of all praise; but it did not help the drama in the slightest, and, as a matter of fact, did not even illustrate Cæsar's bitter description; for Cæsarion did not sit at the feet of Antony and Cleopatra, nor was there any sign of 'all the unlawful issue.' At His Majesty's, Cleopatra was followed up the stairs of the tribunal by a diminutive little child, who appeared to be a page rather than one of the imperial offspring. To illustrate Enobarbus's famous word-picture of Cleopatra's barge was a great temptation, but Mr. Tree manfully

withstood it. True, his Antony and Cleopatra made their entrance on a barge, but that innovation was legitimate enough, and did not materially lengthen the action.

If Shakespeare is not to be performed without such interpolated tableaux as that of Antony and Cleopatra at Alexandria, no great harm will be done to the poet. Most of us will but feel the same annoyance that we experience in reading an illustrated edition of the plays. Mr. Tree's productions, however, go much farther in the art of grangerism. In *Much Ado about Nothing* Beatrice speaks of Claudio as being 'neither sad, nor sick, nor merry, nor well; but civil, count; civil as an orange, and something of that jealous complexion.' Mr. Tree apparently could not understand how so unusual a simile should have entered the mind of Shakespeare's heroine. To make things clear, by way of a footnote, he invented a handsome orange-tree. Some of the fruit had fallen to the ground, and Beatrice's simile was suggested by her having picked up one of them. It is quite natural, of course, that an orange-tree should grow in a Messina garden, but it is equally natural that the commonness of the orange should have suggested the idea to Beatrice. Such 'business' takes time which cannot be spared in a modern representation of Shakespeare. And if the time it takes be inconsiderable it delays the rapidity of repartee. Then, at every production at His Majesty's Theatre there is a deal of unnecessary processioning. It may give pomp to the productions, and it may be natural, but it seriously delays the drama. To the musician, too, the use Mr. Tree makes of incidental music is rather disconcerting. It is possible that harpists and choristers did welcome the arrival of Cleopatra and Antony, but they certainly did not play or sing modern music. That opening scene at His Majesty's made a pompous picture, but I felt that if Shakespeare had desired to herald the entry of his hero and heroine in an operatic or musical comedy style he would have arranged his play in accordance with his intention. Surely he meant us to slip of a sudden into the life of Antony and Cleopatra as if the veil were whisked from the past at a wave of a magician's wand; but he could not foresee, of course, how important is the entry of a modern actor. In many such ways time is wasted in these elaborate productions. I had always imagined, for instance, that when Cleopatra has called for music—'music, moody food of us that trade in love'—and Mardian has entered at the cry of the attendant, the impatient Empress, consumed by her love fever, immediately changes her mind, and exclaims: 'Let it alone.' It has always seemed to me a splendid little touch. Mr. Tree thought otherwise, however, and we have a boy stalking round the room and singing a modern drawing-room song. In my edition of Shakespeare no words are given of the countermanded song, and the poet generally inserted lyrics when he meant them to be sung.

The productions at His Majesty's Theatre are full of many such interpolations. In themselves they are not, perhaps, very important, but the spirit which inspires them is wrong, and in the sum they mean a good deal of delay. It all adds to the necessity of cutting. In the production of *Antony and Cleopatra* there are a couple of excisions which cannot be excused on any grounds. One is the death of Enobarbus. Efforts should have been made to spare that pathetic end of the bluff soldier. The other, and more serious, is the interview of Cæsar with Cleopatra after the death of Antony. When her dying lord asks for a poor last kiss, Cleopatra replies :

> I dare not, dear
> (Dear my lord, pardon), I dare not,
> Lest I be taken ; not the imperious show
> Of the full-fortuned Cæsar ever shall
> Be brooch'd with me.

It was the duty of the dramatist to show us that Cleopatra was true to that resolve—that she would come to Antony to claim that first kiss in their spirit life with lips unsullied by his conqueror. Mr. Tree evidently thinks the statement of the resolve is enough, and that in showing how Cleopatra cast aside all questions of personal safety, and, in spite of Cæsar's pleading, was noble to herself, Shakespeare was guilty of unnecessary length. If it be said that the play was already too long to admit of this fine scene, I would reply that it is worth all the singing girls, the elaborate orgy on Pompey's barge, and the Alexandria tableaux rolled into one. It is drama ; the others are grangerisms, and needless elaborate ones. Such an excision is not only a strong charge in itself against productions which illustrate the material aspects of Shakespeare and ignore the spiritual, but is a condemnation of the actor-manager as supreme authority, for in no theatre save one ruled by an actor would so important a scene for the 'leading lady' be omitted.

IV

There is another matter connected with the use of elaborate scenery which touches the very essence of drama. Every student of the drama knows how gradual has been the growth of scenery. Yet in all the history of the drama there is but scanty evidence that the æsthetics of the subject have received close consideration. Wagner, it is true, wrote much on the matter of scenic art, and he made use of mechanical contrivances as part and parcel of his music-dramas. But Wagner's theories were vitiated by his ideas on the union of all the arts, with music as the predominant partner. Drama is not, and cannot be, a union of all the arts. It has its own conventions, its own essentials. One of its conventions is that human life, in all its twists and turns, must be made clear to an audience as it is never

made clear to a mere spectator of life itself. The manner of doing this has changed. In the past we accepted long soliloquies as part of the convention, but the modern playwright has found that this particular convention, which made for an appearance of unreality, is unnecessary. He obtains the same result by more subtle means and by a more implicit reliance on the art of acting. But the main convention of drama remains. In its higher manifestations it seeks to bare human souls to our sympathy and understanding. Any device which helps towards that result is permissible as part of the illusion of drama, but the *dramatis personæ* of a play must stand out in a relief stronger than life. Their scenic environment should therefore take the same place as the background in a fine portrait. Anything that too closely approaches reality detracts from the importance of the characters. I had an object-lesson in the truth of this theory when witnessing the Warwick Pageant last year. The historical figures had a background of reality—the beautiful grounds of Warwick Castle. The result was not drama, although some of the episodes were dramatic enough. The mood of the day did not fit in with the pageant. The background was separate from the figures, and they were dwarfed to unimportance. I had the same impression in witnessing the scenic splendours of Mr. Beerbohm Tree's *Antony and Cleopatra*. So much colour and magnificence of detail made Antony and Cleopatra seem accessories rather than principals, and it was a relief to the senses when a comparatively simple scene followed one of the stage pictures. Even with these scenes, however, the characters were not always in artistic proportion. Cæsar's house, for instance, was too vast in its vistas, and the immense columns seemed to dwarf the characters to the measure of reality, which is precisely what is not required in drama. Then, again, no greater artistic mistake was ever made than is comprised in the theory of the union of all the arts. Each appeals to a different sense, and I do not believe that human beings can exercise all their senses at once in an equal degree. That is the fundamental weakness of music-drama. If you are interested in the music the stage action passes as a dream, and the scenery does not exist; if you are impressed by the acting you hardly hear the music; and so on. In spoken drama the chief appeal should be to imagination and sympathy. Nothing should be allowed to interfere with the free play of these mental qualities. If you are not colour-blind, a gorgeous *mise-en-scène* must make an effect on your visual senses and weaken concentration on the character. Indeed, so much is this the case with Mr. Tree's productions that a dramatic critic, to give a true idea of them, must become in part a descriptive reporter. We are made more interested in the environment of Antony and Cleopatra than in what they think and feel, which is the subject-matter of drama. Instead of being privileged to understand the inner life of the great

member of the triumvirate and the passionate Empress of Egypt through the magic of the poet's verse and the art of acting, we see them as if we were only average spectators of life. Possibly an actor and an actress of genius could pierce through this sensuous environment and make our souls vibrate with theirs. A Garrick, it is true, was able to hold his audience with a Macbeth attired in a Hanoverian military uniform, as you may see from Zoffany's picture, but it is not safe to order matters for genius. Besides, the senses might easily accept a Hanoverian uniform without any but a first shock. Mr. Tree, on the other hand, hypnotises or narcotises the imagination by the splendour of his mounting and the brilliance of his costumes.

I am not advocating the shabby 'adequate' scenery of third-rate Shakespearian productions, but a new kind of mounting in which the environment of the characters would be conceived on the lines of impressionistic suggestion rather than inartistic reality. We do not want the essays in eccentric design which Mr. Gordon Craig gave us some time ago in his production of Handel's *Acis and Galatea*. He dehumanised drama for the sake of pictorial design. Colour and light should play their part in the creation of atmosphere and mood, but scenery must be nothing but a suggestive background to the characters. The medium of dramatic impression is acting, again acting and always acting, and the mounting of a play should be managed so that it heightens and does not detract from the art of the actor.

E. A. Baughan.

THE FORESTS OF INDIA AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION

In his Indian Budget Speech on the 20th of July, 1906, Mr. Morley paid a well-deserved compliment to the administration of the vast forests of British India when he announced that:

> The State forests of India cover an area of 250,000 square miles, and 66,000,000 cubic feet of timber from the State forests have been extracted, and there has been an increase in the Forest Revenue in five years of more than 600,000*l.* (cheers). I cannot wonder that those who are concerned in these operations look forward with nothing short of exultation to the day when this country will realise what a splendid asset is now being built up in India in connection with these forests.

This statement is by no means too highly coloured or too eulogistic; but even in India itself many of the administrators in high office have perhaps little idea of the potentialities of future wealth that are treasured in the vast forests covering great tracts unsuitable for permanent and self-sustaining agricultural occupation. Indeed, when the hard time of financial pressure came in 1879 the Government of India very seriously considered the question of abolishing the Forest Department of India, which had been founded as a branch of the revenue administration in 1864; and this, although the Famine Commission of 1878 had urged forest conservancy as an important safeguard for agriculture by pointing out the beneficial effect of forests in retaining soil-moisture, apart from the direct advantages of supplying timber, fuel, bamboos, and other woodland produce. But it was mainly the handsome surplus yielded by the teak forests of Burma, the richest forest province in India, which weighed the balance in favour of a more prudent policy and the retention of the Forest Department, to the present greatly enhanced gain of the Imperial revenues, and to the inestimable advantage of Indian agriculture throughout future generations.

The Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, of which the Forest Department was then a branch, was abolished during the financial panic of 1879, but it had to be reconstituted two years later. This was, however, mainly a secretarial rearrangement; whereas the abolition of the Forest Department of India would have

meant an actual loss of ground that it would have been very difficult to recover, and might ultimately have resulted in calamity for Indian agriculture, seeing that further uncontrolled wastage of woodlands, then rapidly proceeding, and comparatively unrestricted clearance for cultivation would have been bound speedily to aggravate the severity and the distress of famines throughout the areas of scanty and precarious rainfall.

This aspect of the question of Indian forest conservancy was not adverted to in Mr. Morley's Budget speech, which naturally only dealt with the present net gain and the still richer golden harvest dimly anticipated in the distant future. And yet the service which Indian forestry indirectly renders to Indian agriculture, as its younger sister and servant, is far more important than any of the direct pecuniary advantages that can be pointed to in the shape of surplus revenue weighing heavy in the treasury, and even forming imposing figures when expressed in the British gold standard.

It would, indeed, be impossible to express in figures or in words, no matter how eloquent in themselves these might both be, the advantages already bestowed on India by following a rational system of forest conservancy. Mere statements of income, expenditure, and net revenue, of total yield and out-turn, of the number of cattle pastured, and the acreage thrown open to grazing, or of similar data of that sort, must fail to represent in anything like true proportions the beneficial work that has already been effected, and for the extension of which in the future there still remains a very wide field. The out-turn from the forests controlled by the Forest Department amounted in 1903 to nearly 246,000,000 cubic feet of timber and fuel, more than 323,000,000 bamboos, and minor produce to the value of over 307,000*l.*; while the income amounted to over 1,481,000*l.*, the expenditure to 811,000*l.*, and the net revenue to 670,000*l.* These satisfactory financial results are due to the constant progress being made in organisation and in the utilisation of forest produce; and, as the efforts of the department in both of these directions are being steadily continued, the revenue results in the future are likely far to surpass those yet attained, because, large though the surplus be, it still only represents somewhat less than 3*l.* per square mile of State forest, or 1½*d.* per acre.

These revenue returns, however, take no account of the vast quantities of produce given gratuitously to villagers or extracted under rights of user confirmed in the settlement of reserves. Thus, in 1903, 11,000,000 cubic feet of timber and fuel were extracted under free grants and over 65,000,000 cubic feet under sanctioned rights of user, besides many millions of bamboos, the estimated value of the forest produce given away free or at reduced rates being upwards of 220,000*l.* The royalties collected on grass and grazing amounted to over 115,000*l.*, but at the same time similar produce to more than

that value was given away free or at reduced rates. And it has always seemed to me that the necessity for and the main justification of having a Forest Department in India is to be found in the assistance it can give to agriculture and to grazing in the most thickly populated tracts fringing the arid zones occurring extensively within the Empire.

If one turn to the census returns of 1901, it is impossible to quote definite details even roughly indicating the national-economic importance of the forests. The number of persons dependent for their means of livelihood on 'wood, cane, and leaves, &c.' is shown as 3,790,492, and 1,886,156 are entered as dependent on *taungya* or *jhum* (shifting cultivation); but these 5,676,648 persons, out of the total population of over 294 millions, represent nothing like the actual number either entirely or partially dependent on the woodlands and on forest produce for procuring work and the means of livelihood. It is impossible to determine how many of those classed under other heads are employed on forest work, or in industries dependent on the woodlands for their raw material, such as wood-cutters and sawyers, timber hauling and floating, fuel-cartage, sale of timber and bamboos, charcoal-burning, cutch-boiling, cart- and boat-building, carpentry and joinery, furniture-making, turnery, carving, sandal-making, cane-work, box-making, brick- and lime-burning, thatching, and many other rural occupations. Some of these employ large numbers of people, as, for instance, thatching, which in Burma alone affords the means of livelihood to over 30,000 persons. The Forest Department of itself provides sustenance for 66,754 souls, of whom 2,440 are the families of forest officers, and 64,314 those of subordinates.

The great importance of forest conservancy, apart from purely commercial considerations, was very clearly pointed out to the Government of India by the expert sent out from England to advise them regarding agriculture in 1892, who urged upon their notice that:

> though immense tracts of country have been denuded in the past, there are still considerable areas which can be taken up and rendered serviceable for climatic ends; and the Forest Department has stepped in none too early in the endeavour to save those wooded tracts which are still left. From climatic considerations alone, the work of the Forest Department is accordingly of importance.[1]

This advice of an expert in agriculture seems to have at last brought home to the Indian Government the necessity for acting on the recommendations made to them thirteen years previously by the Famine Commissioners of 1878, who stated in their Report of July the 7th, 1880, that:

> so far as any immediate advantage is to be sought from the extension of forest in respect to protection against drought, it will, in our opinion, be mainly in

[1] Voelcker, *Report on the Improvement of Indian Agriculture*, 1893, p. 31.

the direction of the judicious inclosure and protection of tracts . . . from which improved and more certain pasture may be secured for the cattle of the vicinity, a supply of firewood secured which may lead to a more general utilisation of animal manure for agriculture, and a possible addition made to the power of the subsoil to retain its moisture, and to the prospect of maintaining the supply of water in the wells. In all cases existing communal rights of pasturage should receive careful attention, and, as far as possible, efforts should be made to extend facilities of this description, and to add to their value by a suitable system of protection. As to the protection of the higher hill-slopes from denudation, it may confidently be stated that they will, in any case, be more useful if kept clothed with wood than subjected to the wasteful and destructive process by which they are brought under partial and temporary cultivation, and that, whether the expectation of an improved water-supply as a consequence of such protection is fully realised or not, there is on other grounds sufficient reason for arranging for the conservation of such tracts where it is practicable.

These recommendations virtually embody the principle upon which the State forests of India have been managed during the last twelve years, under the terms of a resolution issued in October 1894, by the Government of India, after considering Dr. Voelcker's report on agriculture. The policy then adopted, and since followed, was that '*the sole object with which State forests are administered is the public benefit.*'

There was nothing new in Dr. Voelcker's advice, only it was then tendered by one sent out from England to speak with authority and to make practical suggestions which the Secretary of State would see were not to be shelved and disregarded; and no time was lost in giving effect to them.

The beneficial results of having State Reserves had long been recognised in the Central Provinces, where danger from famine is periodical, even though over 21 per cent. of the whole province consists of Government forests. But in a Resolution of the Chief Commissioner dated January 1895, on the scarcity in the Saugor and Damoh districts, issued subsequently to the declaration of the Government policy in October 1894, it was officially recorded that:

to the labouring poor relief was afforded by opening the forests for the free collection of grass and fuel, and for the gathering of edible roots and fruits. In all times of partial scarcity the poorer classes in the affected districts are accustomed to resort in large numbers to the forests, and to eke out a scanty subsistence, not merely by collecting roots and fruits, but by the sale of firewood in the adjacent villages and towns. Nothing that was done for the relief of the people is said to have been more appreciated than the concession made in this respect, and the number who resorted to the forests and earned a living by selling wood and grass was very large. A further concession was made to the agricultural classes by permission to graze their cattle free of cost in all Government forests except in those tracts that are always closed to grazing.

The experience of successive years in the Central Provinces has fully confirmed what is above indicated. During the hard times of famine and scarcity from 1896 to 1900, most of the forests were again

thrown open to the people for the collection of edible fruits, seeds, gums, leaves, and roots; and in 1900 a general seeding of bamboos, which occurs periodically at wide intervals with most species, gave a welcome supply of small grain, like rice; so that in the provincial report on the famine of 1899–1900 it was again recorded that 'the opening of the forests to the people is one of the most useful measures of relief in this province.'

In the United Provinces, recently formed by amalgamating the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, similar experience showed the value of forest conservancy during the famine years of 1896 and 1897. All the State forests were thrown open for the free collection of edible products, and all the areas available for grazing were opened freely, wherever necessary, when winter rainfall had established the grass-crop; and, as the report thereon states:

> Thus, though the supply of dry and green fodder was defective and its price high, yet there was nowhere any complete failure, and in those distressed tracts where cattle were sold in large numbers they were usually sold in order to purchase food, and not because it had become impossible to support them.

This proves, if proof be needed, that the conservancy of woodlands and grazing tracts is ultimately even directly to the advantage of agriculturists, though at the time of the formation and settlement of reserved forests the rural population may fail to see the advantage of having their customary rights of user defined, regulated, and often diminished, or even extinguished by purchase or otherwise.

In view of such experience, the question may well arise if it is not a duty which Government should recognise as incumbent upon it, to give careful consideration to the possibility of enclosing and sowing or planting poor waste lands, uncultivated and unculturable at present, situated within the dry and often arid zones throughout different parts of India, and should not also, if once convinced of the possibility of such improvements, devote a fair proportion of the large surplus forest revenue to such works for the future benefit of agriculture and rural conditions. Rajputana, for example, is mainly dependent upon tanks and lakes for its reserve water-supply, and even some of the largest of these had, in June 1906, been dry for months past. In Kotah, again, the drought due to deficient rainfall since 1902 resulted in the drying up of the big lake; and it has only been by copious rainfall, amounting to ten inches during the previous month, that it became refilled in July 1906. Surely sowing and planting, even of lowly kinds of grasses and shrubs to begin with, would be a step towards helping to improve local conditions regarding atmosphere and soil-moisture.

Questions of the above nature refer only to specific portions of the Indian Empire, because not only the climate and the rainfall, but also the distribution, the extent, and the character of the forestal

vegetation vary enormously in different provinces, and in the different parts of most provinces. Indeed, the distribution and the character of the forests depend mainly on the influence of the monsoon rains; the south-west monsoon, lasting from June to September, bringing its moisture-laden winds first to the lower western coast of the Indian peninsula and the west coast of Bengal and Burma, and the north-east monsoon, lasting from October to December, making itself chiefly felt along the eastern coast of the peninsula. Consequently some regions are affected to any great extent only by one of these monsoon currents, while others are affected by both, and of course also in different and greatly varying degree. Elevation above sea-level likewise exerts an appreciable influence on forestal vegetation, both directly and indirectly, through its determining influence on temperature and atmospheric humidity.

To generalise roughly, in order to obviate unnecessary detail, it may be said that the three main categories of dry, evergreen, and deciduous forests are respectively to be found in the arid and *dry zones* having a scanty and precarious rainfall averaging from 5 to 10 up to 15 to 30 inches per annum, in the *wet zones* with a well-assured rainfall of over 75 inches a year (and often amounting to far more than 200 inches in some parts of the seaboard), and in the various *intermediate zones*, often rather moist, where the annual average rainfall, precarious during periods of weak south-west monsoon currents, usually varies from between 30 to 50 and 50 to 75 inches per annum. The arid and dry zones, with scanty and often merely scrub-like vegetation, comprise Rajputana, Sind, Baluchistan, and most of the Punjáb, in the north-west portion of India, Bellary and the surrounding tracts towards the south of the peninsula, and the central portions of Burma in Further India. The *wet zones*, with their characteristic evergreen forests, occur along the south-west and the south-east coasts of the peninsula, and more particularly along the coast-line and throughout the hilly tracts of Eastern Bengal, Assam, and Burma. The *intermediate zones*, sometimes dry, sometimes moist in their general character, are mostly clothed, where still wooded, with deciduous forests, the specific character of which varies greatly in different localities according to rainfall, elevation, configuration and nature of soil, &c. These deciduous forests, in which the most valuable timber-trees are to be found, extend throughout the greater portion of Central and Southern India and all along the base of the Himalayas, and also form the main covering of the hills of Central Burma, surrounding its dry and often arid core.

The chief timber-trees for which there is as yet any market occur scattered in family groups throughout the various classes of deciduous forests, sometimes growing more or less gregariously and at other times more or less sporadically, according to the special kind of tree and the local conditions as to soil and atmosphere. The most import-

ant of these have always been, and still are, teak (*Tectona grandis*), the great revenue-producing tree of Burma, but also occurring largely throughout the central, western, and southern portions of the deciduous central and south-western tracts in India; sál (*Shorea robusta*), found all along the deciduous belt skirting the Himalayas, and occupying also the north-eastern portion of the deciduous tracts in the peninsula, in Bengal, Orissa, and the Central Provinces, where the zones of teak and sál overlap; deodar (*Cedrus Deodara*), growing along with many kinds of pine and fir in the alpine and subalpine forests of the Himalayas; shishim or sissu (*Dalbergia Sissoo*), the 'shittim-wood' so often mentioned in the Bible, occurring throughout northern and especially north-western India, in and near the river-beds; the blackwood (*Dalbergia latifolia*), or rosewood of Bombay; khair or cutch (*Acacia Catechu*), from which the well-known brown dye and tanning material is obtained by chopping up the wood and boiling the chips, and which occurs chiefly in Burma, growing along with teak in the less moist intermediate zones of the deciduous tracts, and also in the similar areas throughout the *terai* or low hills of Northern India; the babul (*Acacia arabica*) of the drier tracts of Northern and Central India; the sandalwood (*Santalum album*) of Mysore and Coorg; and the red sanders (*Pterocarpus santalinus*), growing in Madras to the north-east of the sandalwood tracts.

These, and a few other woods, mostly of the heavy, hard iron-wood class, constitute the chief timber-trees by the extraction, sale, and export of which the bulk of the revenue from the forests of India is obtained. Yet the very few kinds of timber for which there is as yet a market are an exceedingly small proportion of the 1,500 species of trees that have been identified and specified in the Indian woodlands. There is a vast wealth of fine timber, and especially of kinds eminently suitable by their beauty of colour and of grain for furniture and cabinet work, for which no market demand yet exists. Constant efforts are being made to try to create such a demand, but it is difficult to bring such unknown and unappreciated woods upon the European market—because, with regard to timber, the oft-quoted adage *omne ignotum pro magnifico* does not hold good, but the very reverse of it. When such markets can be created, however, the forest revenue will soon become greatly increased.

Consequent on the varying conditions of climate, rainfall, and elevation, and also on the density of population and the extent to which clearances of the primæval woodlands have long ago been made for agricultural purposes, the distribution of such forests as still remain shows extreme differences in the several provinces, and even in the several parts of each province. Throughout the whole of Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier there is only 2 per cent. of forest; in the United Provinces it is under 4 per cent.; in Bengal just under, and in the Punjáb just over, 9 per cent.; in Bombay it

is 12, and in Madras 13½ per cent.; in the Central Provinces and Berar, 21 per cent.; in Assam, 45 per cent.; and in Burma, 75 per cent. of the total area of the province; while the State forests occupy just exactly 24 per cent. of the total area of our Indian Empire.

But these figures are deceptive, when one wishes to consider how the forests happen to be distributed with regard to the benefits they can afford to agriculture and the rural population, because in the areas of densest population and exclusively or mainly devoted to agriculture—just, in fact, where woodlands are most wanted—there often happen to be few or no forests. Thus, in the great Gangetic plain, from above the delta and stretching far away to the north-west into the Punjáb, a densely populated area swarming with scores of millions of human beings, there are few or no forests remaining: all the primæval woodlands have long ago been cleared away to give place to permanent cultivation, and there are now only scattered groves or 'mango-topes,' planted for their fruit, and to afford shade and shelter to cattle.

.

In order to try to hasten, in Mr. Morley's words, 'the day when this country will realise what a splendid asset is now being built up in India in connection with these forests,' I should like, as an officer formerly in its service, to sketch the origin and growth of the department, and to describe briefly, in rough outline, its administration, and the gradual progress and development that have taken place up to the present time, when its further rapid expansion in every direction is limited only by the determination of the Government of India to regard it in great measure as a revenue-producing department, in place of acting more consistently with their own principle declared in 1894, and of utilising a larger share of forest revenue in planting and other works of improvement for the benefit of agriculture and for the general welfare of the rural population.

During the early days of British influence and rule in India, while the present Empire was in gradual process of formation, the sale of forest produce played a very small part in the affairs of the old East India Company. The people took from the woodlands all that they wanted for domestic and agricultural requirements, and, except near the seaports, there could have been little or no demand for timber as a marketable product.

The first of such produce that was able to command a sale was the teak timber found on the Western Ghâts and along the Malabar coast, which was worked during the latter part of the eighteenth century and sold to the naval authorities at Bombay. Ships were there built of teak, which sailed for Britain laden with the shipments made by the factors of the Company, and on their arrival here they were admitted to British registration. This was felt to be a grievance, and the shipbuilders of London memorialised Government with a

view to the prohibition of further shipbuilding in India, asserting that 'there is not any real scarcity of oak timber in Great Britain.' But facts were too strong for the malcontents. There was plain and abundant evidence that the continental wars had resulted in the clearance of many oak woodlands for corn-growing throughout England, and it was found, as the result of a careful investigation into this then very important subject, that 'our immediate reliance for relief must rest briefly on the teak of India.' In fact, in 1805 the Court of Directors had sent out a despatch inquiring to what extent the King's Navy might, in view of the diminishing supplies of oak in England, depend on a permanent supply of teak timber from Malabar. And thus arose the teak export trade from Southern India and Burma, which still forms the chief source of forest revenue to the Government of India.

The earliest attempt at anything like forest administration was made in 1806, when Captain Watson, of the Police, was appointed Conservator of Forests in South-Western India. Armed with very indefinite powers under a proclamation of April 1807, which he used with much energy, he soon established a practical monopoly in teak throughout Malabar and Travancore. In these districts, as was also later on found to be the case in Burma, teak was regarded as a 'royal tree'; yet the teak forests of Malabar had during the earliest days of British occupation been regarded as private property, whereas Captain Watson's action ignored such private claims as had thus sprung up, and practically annihilated them. But the local discontent grew so great and became so clamorous that the Conservatorship was abolished in 1823. The landowners then reassumed the proprietary rights they had originally usurped, and unrestricted fellings took place to such an extent as to exhaust the forests. The price of teak then rose, and in 1831 the Indian Navy Board recommended the reappointment of a Conservator.

In the meantime the attention of Government had been drawn to the teak forests of Burma, where shipbuilding was carried on at the ports of Rangoon in Pegu and Moulmein in Tenasserim; and on the conclusion of the first Burmese war, in 1826, the province of Tenasserim was annexed along with Arakan, the seaboard tract on the Bay of Bengal. In 1827, Dr. Wallich, the celebrated Indian botanist, had been deputed to examine the Tenasserim teak tracts, and reported them to be richer than any of those in India proper. But he was careful to add that their resources were not inexhaustible, and that they, too, would be ruined unless worked under systematic and conservative management. This sound advice was only partially adopted. In 1829 the forests were opened to timber merchants, who were granted felling leases, and who paid an *ad valorem* duty on timber extracted.

Within a few years it became common knowledge locally that

the forests were being rapidly depleted of all mature teak timber; and in 1837 Dr. Helfer, Wallich's successor, was deputed to examine and report on them. He urged the formation of large plantations; but no definite action was taken by Government, and the merchants naturally went on felling and extracting as much marketable timber as they could. In 1841, in spite of much opposition, the old leases were cancelled and new agreements were entered into, with a special condition that five teak seedlings should be planted to replace each tree felled. But this arrangement did not work well, and although a small departmental staff was organised by Mr. J. R. Colvin, the Commissioner, in 1847, and placed under the Public Works Engineer, yet this arrangement failed to provide proper control and conservancy.

In the Madras Presidency the recommendation made by the Indian Navy Board in 1831 had been renewed from time to time, and various local inquiries had been made; and in 1842 the Court of Directors authorised the formation of teak plantations to provide future supplies. Thus began, in 1843, the celebrated and now very valuable Nilambur teak plantations, with the formation of which the name of Mr. Conolly, Collector of Malabar, will ever be associated.

In Bombay, Dr. Gibson, who was at this same time, in addition to his ordinary duties as Government botanist, also devoting special attention to timber and forest conservancy, drew the attention of Government in 1846 to the serious climatic effect of the great wastage of woodlands then rapidly going on, and to the ultimate disastrous consequences to agriculture. The matter thus brought before their notice induced the Court of Directors to forward a despatch, No. 21, dated the 7th of July, 1847, asking the Government of India to ascertain and report to them the '*effect of trees on the climate and productiveness of a country, and the results of extensive clearances of timber.*' That is nearly sixty years ago, but no definite report has ever yet been made in this very important matter, notwithstanding the frequent scarcity and the famines that have occurred since then, and which have no doubt been at any rate intensified, and enlarged as to the local area affected, by the clearance of woodlands for cultivation during these last sixty years. On this point, however, it may also be remarked here that the question of forestry in India was then attracting the attention of the scientific world. In 1851 the British Association appointed a committee to consider the economic and physical results of the destruction of tropical forests; and the report made by the committee strongly urged conservative measures and tree-planting. So far as the Bombay Presidency was concerned, however, the immediate result of the representations made to the Court of Directors was the formal appointment of Dr. Gibson as Conservator of Forests throughout the Bombay Presidency in 1847.

Meanwhile, the second Burmese war had taken place, which ended by the annexation, in 1852, of the central seaboard provinces

of Pegu and Martaban. They were rich not only in the very fertile tracts of the Irrawaddy and the Sittang valleys, but also in the dense forests clothing the eastern slopes of the Arakan hills, the whole of the Pegu range, and the western slopes of the Paunglin hills, which contained far larger and more valuable supplies of teak than were obtained in Tenasserim in 1826. And in arbitrarily fixing the limit of the annexed territory at 19½° N. latitude, Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General of India, thought that he had thus secured to Britain teak-producing tracts that would suffice to provide ample supplies of timber in the future.

In Pegu and Martaban the mistake formerly made in Travancore was not repeated. Teak was a 'royal tree,' the monopoly of the king; and almost immediately after the annexation all the woodlands and waste lands were declared to be the property of Government, rough forest rules were drawn up, and Dr. McClelland was appointed Superintendent of Forests in the new British province. After two years of inspection he submitted a report, the consideration of which induced Lord Dalhousie to formulate in outline a definite policy with regard to forest administration in Burma, under which revised forest rules were issued in 1855. Dr. McClelland retired in January 1856, and was succeeded by Dr. (now Sir Dietrich) Brandis, who continued working on the lines adopted by his predecessor.

During the same year, 1856, Dr. Cleghorn was appointed Conservator of Forests in the Madras Presidency, and his reports made from time to time urged strongly upon Government, like those submitted by Dr. Gibson in Bombay, the necessity of claiming all rights to forests not clearly provable to be private property, of exercising conservative control, and of restricting the destructive system of shifting cultivation on hill-clearances by the more or less nomadic tribes inhabiting the woodlands.

This wasteful system, common to all the wooded tracts of the Indian Empire, and known by such local names as *jhum*, *dahya*, *taungya*, &c., consists in felling all trees and bamboos (except some of the largest trees, if such can be killed by girdling) during January and February, and then burning them in March or April before the advent of the first rains, when they have become dried up into a vast mass of intensely inflammable matter. No attempt being made to control the fires, they were allowed to overrun the surrounding forest, so that hundreds of square miles would be passed through by scorching fires in the course of every hot season. In the fertile virgin soil thus laid bare, and with the rich top-dressing thus given to it by the ash of the burned trees and bamboos, rice crops were sown or planted for one year, and only seldom for a second year; and then a move was made to another part of the woods, to repeat the destructive process. Thus, not only were large quantities of timber of marketable value destroyed, but the damage done by the fires being

allowed to spread into the surrounding woodlands in all directions also caused considerable injury to these. It was only at a later date in Indian forest administration that anything like control could be exercised over this nomadic and casual cultivation, and then practically only in the reserved forests. Some idea of the extent to which damage was formerly done in this manner may be formed from the fact that, according to the census returns of 1901, over 1,886,000 persons were still dependent on such shifting cultivation for their livelihood.

It may here be noted that during this early stage of Indian forestry the men called upon to occupy the foremost positions with regard to introducing systematic conservancy were all three of them officers of the Indian Medical Service—Dr. Gibson in Bombay (1847), Dr. McClelland in Burma (1852), and Dr. Cleghorn in Madras (1856). On his retirement Dr. Gibson was officially designated, in a valedictory Gazette notification, 'the Father of Forestry' in Western India; and to Drs. McClelland and Cleghorn is due similar credit with regard to Burma and Madras. But this in no manner diminishes the great credit due subsequently to Dr. Brandis—a botanist, not a doctor in medicine—who later on laid the firm and broad foundations upon which the present sound system of Indian forest administration has been securely and laboriously built up.

At first Dr. Brandis had very serious difficulties to contend with in the opposition of the timber merchants throughout Pegu and Martaban; and his duties became much heavier when, in 1857, the Tenasserim forests were also placed under his charge. But the policy he advocated met with the warm approval of Colonel (afterwards Sir Arthur) Phayre, Commissioner of Pegu (subsequently the first Chief Commissioner of British Burma) and of Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General. He introduced rough working plans, based upon running linear surveys through the forests for the enumeration of mature and immature teak trees and for estimating the capability of each forest, so as not to overwork them in view of the necessity of maintaining the continuity of future supplies of first-class timber. He also gradually introduced a system of direct departmental extraction by Burmese villagers who owned elephants, and who thus became contractors for felling, floating, and delivering the timber, at fixed contract rates according to size and quality, at the Government depôts at Rangoon and Moulmein, where the logs were sold by public auction.

The struggle between the merchants and the Superintendent of Forests was continued for several years, and in the early 'sixties the mercantile influence brought to bear at home and in Calcutta was so powerful that most of the Pegu forests were thrown open to leaseholders for a fixed term of years, subject, however—and this was a matter of the utmost importance—to the control of the Forest Depart-

ment in selecting, hammer-marking, and 'girdling' or ringing the trees to be felled for extraction after seasoning for two or three years on the stump. This condition secured the forests against being overworked; but it afterwards led to illicit girdling to such an extent that the Government of India subsequently in 1873, passed orders prohibiting the issue of any further leases of teak-tracts in British Burma.

The only forest tracts not thus given over for many years to the Rangoon timber merchants as leaseholders were the Tharrawaddy and the Southern Prome forests, on the western slopes of the Pegu hill-range; and these have since then been continuously worked by direct departmental agency, to the great advantage of the Indian treasury. It would be almost impossible to over-estimate the benefits that have accrued to the Government of India, both financially and indirectly, as the outcome of the prudent policy and the wise measures then introduced into Burma by Dr. Brandis.

About this same time, forest administration was introduced on a small scale into the different provinces of Upper and Central India, where the impetus to clearance of woodlands for cultivation, and the felling of the more valuable kinds of timber for railway sleepers, &c., were gradually forcing the local Governments to take steps to try and introduce a rational system of conservancy. The lead was taken by the Punjáb, where rough forest rules were promulgated in 1855, and small local departments were formed in the North-Western and the Central Provinces in 1860, and in Oudh in 1861. But the Government of India soon came to the conclusion that these purely provincial efforts at conservancy lacked that co-ordination which was essential if work was to proceed upon prudent and well-considered lines with a view to future development according to the various local necessities and possibilities.

Dr. Brandis from Burma and Dr. Cleghorn from Madras were therefore deputed, in 1862, to examine and report on the woodlands of Northern India, and to advise the Government of India with regard to the organisation and introduction of a suitable system of forest conservancy. The western tracts were assigned to Dr. Cleghorn, and the eastern to Dr. Brandis; and, after considering the reports submitted, the Government of India established a Forest Department on the 1st of April, 1864, as a branch of the Public Works Department, and Dr. Brandis was appointed the first Inspector-General of Forests to the Government of India, which office he held for nineteen years, till his retirement on the 23rd of April, 1883. Shortly before this, in January 1862, the three commissionerships of Arakan, Pegu, and Tenasserim had been amalgamated and formed into the Chief Commissionership of British Burma, and Dr. Brandis was then appointed first Conservator in the new province. His transfer on deputation to India in November 1862, and his subsequent appointment as Inspector-General in 1864, were probably, however, even more bene-

ficial to Burmese forestry than if he had remained in the province; because, with his intimate knowledge of the teak forests and his greater influence at the headquarters of the Government of India, he could in his new position of authority do more for effective conservation than if he had remained as Conservator, and acting under the direction of another officer ignorant of Burma's general circumstances, requirements, and future possibilities.

The primary duties of the Inspector-General were, and still are, to advise the Government of India on the forest business which comes before it from all the different parts and provinces of the Empire. He must possess administrative ability, although he is officially debarred from exerting any direct administrative authority in connection with provincial forest administration. He can communicate direct with local Governments and with their Conservators, and he can introduce forest business to the notice of the Government of India; but he is prohibited from issuing any specific order to the Conservators, who are the provincial heads of the Forest Department, in charge of Forest Circles. He can, however, make recommendations to them; and, if these be not acted upon, he can communicate his views to the local Government and make suggestions concerning them. As a matter of fact, however, Conservators consider themselves as being directly subordinate to the Inspector-General; they regard his suggestions as virtual orders, and are just as loyal to him as they are to their own local Government. This arrangement has the advantage that, whenever a serious divergence of views manifests itself, each side finds it necessary to submit the matter to the local Government for consideration and orders.

For several years the work of departmental organisation mainly occupied the attention of Dr. Brandis. Conservators of Forests were appointed to the Punjáb, Bengal, and Coorg in 1864; a Forest Act was passed in 1865, under which rules were promulgated at different times for the various provinces; Berar was amalgamated with the Central Provinces in 1865, and subsequently made a separate charge in 1868; in 1868 a Conservator was also appointed to the North-Western Provinces, where the small departmental staff had, since 1860, been under the orders of the local Commissioners, and Assam was made into a separate charge; and in 1872 a special Forest Survey Branch was created to prepare maps to be used as the basis of forming definite working-plans for the more valuable forests (and since then about 65,000 square miles of reserved forests have already been surveyed and mapped).

As departmental organisation developed, the necessity of having a body of well-trained officers soon became apparent. At first the department was recruited by the appointment of military officers and others who seemed to be fond of rough camp life, or to show some aptitude for carrying out the simple methods of surveying

and enumerating the stock of timber in the forests, and of administering the new forest rules then in force. To be fond of big-game shooting and to be interested in botany or zoology were then the best qualifications for an appointment in the new department.

After voluminous correspondence the Government of India and the Secretary of State agreed to the selection of two young German forest officers as special assistants, and to the commencement of continental training for two and a half years of probationers selected by means of open competitions held in London. These two special assistants, Messrs. Schlich and Ribbentrop, ultimately became Dr. Brandis' successors, the former acting as Inspector-General from the 16th of October, 1881, to the 25th of February, 1885, and the latter from then till his retirement on the 1st of November, 1900. Next to Dr. Brandis' name, Mr. Ribbentrop's is that which will always be most closely associated with the rise and progress of the Forest Department; for it is not likely that any future Inspector-General will ever again hold the helm of affairs for anything like so long a time as he did. The system of continental training was begun in 1867 and continued till 1884, and ninety-seven trained officers were thus appointed in India from 1869 to 1886. From 1885 to 1905, when the training was mainly given at Coopers Hill College, in Surrey, 152 men have been prepared for the Indian Forest Service, making in all 249 trained forest officers, including those now about to proceed to India this autumn. From October 1905, the training of probationers has, on the abolition of Coopers Hill College, been relegated to Oxford University—at any rate until 1908.

The addition of a regular supply of trained men to the department, from 1869 onwards, soon led to the expansion of work in all directions, and to the number of Conservatorships being from time to time increased in Bombay, Burma, the North-Western Provinces, and subsequently also in Madras and the Central Provinces. Some idea of the expansion that has gradually taken place since these early days may be formed from the fact that in 1869, when the first departmental list of officers was published, there were only fifty-seven officers, whereas now there are 195 trained officers belonging to the Imperial Service, 145 Eurasian and Indian officers belonging to the Provincial Service, and 465 Gazetted Subordinates who have mostly been trained at the Forest School established in 1878 at Dehra Dún, in the North-Western Provinces, which has now (1906) been transformed into the Imperial Forest College, with a special branch for scientific research regarding sylviculture, forest botany, and forest zoology. . . .

As now organised, the Forest Department is a branch of the Department of Revenue and Agriculture in the Government of India, and is in the charge of the Member of Council holding the portfolio of that Department. It consists of an *Imperial Forest Service*

to which belong the Inspector-General with the Government of India, a Chief Conservator in Burma, and thirteen Conservators who are the administrative officers in charge of the provincial departments (*circles*) and directly responsible to the various local Governments through their Revenue Secretary. These circles consist of the various forest divisions in charge of 130 Deputy and 65 Assistant Conservators of the Imperial Forest Service, forming the executive staff under the Conservator's orders; while the *Provincial Forest Service*, recruited entirely in India, consists of 32 Extra Deputy and 113 Extra Assistant Conservators, all of whom may be placed in charge of minor divisions. *The Subordinate Forest Service* consists of 465 Forest Rangers, gazetted to ranges, and of a very large non-gazetted staff of Foresters and Forest Guards for subordinate duties in the forest beats into which the ranges are divided. But this staff is no longer able to cope with the work to be done, and a reorganisation scheme is now under consideration, which will, when adopted, considerably strengthen the department and enable it to extend its operations.

The first Forest Act of 1865 was soon found to be so indefinite and defective as to make new legislation necessary; but the draft proposals submitted in 1868 had to be discussed, re-drafted, and reconsidered so often that it was not until 1878 that a good and practical Indian Forest Act was passed. It is therefore from 1878 that the really systematic conservancy of the Indian forests may be dated; while well-regulated and proper organisation of office and jungle work dates from the issue, in 1877, of the first edition of the Forest Department Code giving specific directions for the conduct of all branches of business.

The Indian Forest Act of 1878 gave power to the Government to deal with private rights in the forests throughout which the State owned the chief proprietary right. But its provisions were not found suitable to the local conditions obtaining in Burma and Madras, for which separate Acts were passed in 1880 and 1882. These are the Acts (subsequently amended) now in force, except in Burma, for which a new and more comprehensive Act was passed in 1902, so as to unify the forest laws obtaining throughout both Lower and Upper Burma (annexed in 1886, and made subject to a special Forest Regulation); and under their authority Forest Rules are promulgated according to the various circumstances and requirements of the several provinces.

The guiding principle upon which the forest administration under these Acts and rules is based is that State forests should be managed for the public benefit, and should be so worked as to afford reasonable facilities for the use of forest produce by the public, while at the same time providing the necessary protection for their proper conservation with regard to the growth of timber, fuel, &c., and to the retention and storage of soil-moisture. According to the extent to which

control is considered necessary or active management can be undertaken, the State forests are classified as *reserved*, and *protected* or *unclassed*, the latter category including indefinite tracts of wooded land, especially in Burma, much of which may subsequently be cleared and utilised for agriculture as population increases.

The State Reserved Forests are of four classes. There are first of all those which need to be reserved from climatic considerations or for physical reasons, such as preventing the destruction of agricultural lands by hill-torrents. Then come those containing supplies of marketable timber, such as teak, sál, deodar, and other valuable trees. In these forests all reasonable facilities are given to the neighbouring rural population for the satisfaction, on easy terms, of their actual requirements as to building-timber, fuel, thatching, fodder, grass, cattle-grazing, and edible roots and fruits for themselves, with respect to which considerations of income are subordinated to the satisfaction of these requirements under the imposition of whatever restrictions may be necessary. In particular, the destructive system of shifting temporary cultivation is only permitted where jungle tribes are dependent on it for their sustenance, when it must only be exercised under necessary regulations. A third class consists of minor forests producing small timber or such as has no great marketable value; and these are managed chiefly in the interests of the rural population, fuel and grazing being supplied at moderate rates, while a smaller sum is paid by those living near the forests than is levied on those coming from other localities. And, finally, there are pasture lands, which, even more than the minor forests, are managed mainly in the interests of the villagers in their vicinity. In round numbers, there are now 100,000 square miles of State Reserved Forests, and 150,000 square miles of protected forests; but gradual additions are being made to the former by the selection and reservation of the more important tracts to be found among the latter. In both classes of forest, however, the most important measures of conservancy are the prevention, so far as possible, of the ground fires which tend to overrun and devastate the forests, the maintenance of a due supply of seed-bearing trees, and the regeneration and improvement and cultivation of the more valuable kinds of timber-trees.

Provision was made in the Indian Forest Act for the formation of communal or village forests, but very few of this class have been successfully brought under conservation. Private forests are of limited area and are being gradually exhausted, except where they have been leased to Government.

In every province some of the more valuable timber-trees throughout the unclassed forests have been declared to be 'reserved trees,' and can only be felled under special licence, sometimes granted free, but usually on payment of fixed felling and tonnage rates. Outside the reserved forests the rural population are generally allowed to

obtain from the State forests timber, fuel, bamboos, and grass for their own use free of charge; while inside the reserves rights of user acknowledged at the time of the 'settlement' previous to reservation are preserved to the privileged public, and other persons are only permitted to extract timber or other produce on payment of fees and under special licence. Thus, the forest revenue is raised by the extraction and sale of, or by royalties levied on, timber, fuel, bamboos, grazing, charcoal, canes, and other forest produce.

Reserved forests are not formed out of portions of the protected or unclassed State forests in any haphazard or arbitrary manner, for careful inquiry is made into the question of customary rights or privileges that may have been long exercised by the neighbouring population. Where it seems desirable that any new reserve or any extension of an existing reserve should be made, the proposals are submitted by the divisional forest officer through the Collector or Deputy Commissioner in charge of the district. By him they are submitted with remarks to the Commissioner of the division, who forwards them to the Conservator for submission to the local Government. Any objections to reservation that have been made by the Collector or the Commissioner are considered along with the departmental proposal; and if the Government think active steps in the direction of reservation are advisable, a notification of intention to reserve is published in the official Gazette, and a civil officer is appointed for the 'settlement' of the proposed reserve, by holding inquiry into the existence, nature, and extent of any rights to land included within the specified boundaries or to extract produce from it. This 'forest settlement officer' then publishes a similar proclamation and issues copies of it printed in the vernacular to every village in the vicinity of the land, and a period of at least three months is allowed for the receipt of petitions objecting to reservation or claiming rights of user. On a specified date he has then to hold a formal judicial inquiry on the spot, to record all the evidence offered, and to investigate the claims made to proprietary rights or customary user as to grazing, produce, &c.; and in the case of shifting cultivation he must record his opinion as to whether the custom should be permitted or prohibited wholly or in part, and must make a record of those to whom rights or privileges should be confirmed, or he can estimate the money value of petty rights with a view to their extinction by purchase. The proceedings are then submitted to the local Government. But any person feeling himself aggrieved can appeal within three months to the Collector or Deputy Commissioner of the district, and the local Government may, if it thinks this necessary, appoint a forest court of three persons to consider and adjudicate on such appeals. When these various matters have been disposed of, the local Government, if satisfied that reservation is desirable, may, by notification in the official Gazette, declare the forest to be reserved

from a certain date, and specify definitely the limits and boundary marks. The forest is then demarcated by the Forest Department, with numbered cairns, posts, boundary boards, and blaze marks on tree-stems; and, in the case of forests containing much valuable timber, fellings remain in abeyance until a working-plan has been drawn up, and has been formally approved by the local Government. Within five years the local Government may rescind or modify any order made regarding the settlement and reservation; but, after that, the special sanction of the Government of India is necessary to any further alterations that may be proposed.

The formation of scientific working-plans for the various reserved forests was commenced in 1884, and up till now they have been prepared and approved for areas aggregating 36,000 square miles. But as their preparation necessitates an expensive survey, usually on the scale of four inches to the mile, and the employment of a special working-plans officer, with a large staff of enumerators, such further special schemes of management are, on account of their expense, only likely to be formed for reserves containing important supplies of marketable timber. In such cases, however, they are framed under due safeguard against rash felling or overworking in any manner.

While operations are in progress the working-plans officer specially deputed to the duty submits to the Conservator draft proposals indicating the lines he thinks should be followed, and which he has previously discussed fully with the Conservator. These proposals are then forwarded by the Conservator, with such remarks as he thinks necessary, to the Inspector-General, who returns them with his approval or with appropriate suggestions. On the field-work being completed and the scheme drawn up and printed, it is submitted by the Conservator to the local Government, and by them forwarded to the Inspector-General for his opinion; and the latter has then the opportunity either of expressing his approval or else of pointing out technical objections, in case the Conservator has not accepted any previous suggestions which may perhaps have been offered concerning the draft proposals. Should there be difference of opinion on technical points between the Conservator and the Inspector-General, the matter has to be threshed out in the way of explanations, until the local Government finds itself in a position to approve and accord final sanction to the working-plan, which is then brought into force for the next thirty years, with the certainty that during this period the various annual falls to be made are well within the 'possibility' of the forest, and are not an encroachment on the capital in timber, or beyond the annual increment accruing within the forest.

With regard to the teak forests in Burma, the most valuable in the Empire from a revenue point of view, it has been found in the course of such investigations that it takes from about 150 years in the comparatively moist zone to 180 years in the rather dry zone of

the deciduous forests for a tree to attain good marketable dimensions. These periods have accordingly been accepted as the normal time for one complete rotation of teak, from seedling to maturity, and these two life-cycles or generations are respectively divided into five and six periods of thirty years each, so that the annual falls to be made, say, from 1890 to 1920, are numerically laid down, both as to locality and extent, for each year till 1920, when a revised allotment will have to be made for the following thirty years.

While such schemes of management secure continuity in the extraction of timber for revenue purposes, they also prescribe the various measures that are to be carried out, so far as the available establishment and as funds permit, in order to improve the proportion, the quality, and the rate of growth of the more valuable timber-trees. Such cultural measures consist mainly of sowing and planting, and felling or girdling the less valuable kinds of trees interfering with the growth of teak, sál, deodar, &c.; and the success of these is dependent on protection being secured against fire, owing to the increased amount of inflammable matter thus collected inside the areas operated over.

Fire-protection is provided for by prescriptions laid down in the Forest Acts and Rules; but special measures have also to be taken, which are extended to about 40,000 square miles. These measures consist chiefly in clearing and maintaining 'fire-tráces,' which are broad paths kept as free as possible from inflammable débris during the hot season, and in employing watchers to check fires coming from the outside, and to prevent the entrance of persons who might cause fire either wilfully or through negligence. As is also the case in European countries, fires which break out inside forests are usually caused by ill-disposed persons or for purposes of personal advantage; and throughout India the most common cause of incendiarism is to provide for the early growth of succulent grass, or for some similar object. But fire-protection is on the whole decidedly successful, failures usually amounting only to about 5 per cent. of the total area attempted to be protected. The difficulty of effective supervision during the hottest and driest time of the year, the scarcity of labour, the indifference or hostility of the rural population, and the carelessness and inefficiency of the lower subordinate staff, all combine to make this work one of the most trying duties of the divisional forest officer; and when to these are added an unusually prolonged dry season, with strong winds blowing from burned areas outside, his labour is apt to be in vain.

Although undoubtedly of great direct advantage in promoting the growth of sál in Northern India, and of both sál and teak in Central India—that is to say, in some of the drier forest areas—fire-protection in some of the moister zones, as in Burma and Assam, and along the foot of the Himalayas, has been found to favour the increase and growth of the less valuable trees at the expense of the more valuable

kinds. These have therefore to be increased numerically by means of sowing and planting, and by felling or girdling trees of less or no value. The area over which such 'improvement-fellings' have been hitherto made cannot be stated; but plantations have been formed to the extent of about 135,000 acres, more than one-half of which are teak plantations made in Burma, chiefly with the aid of the Karen hill-tribesmen and by utilising for this purpose the *taungya*-clearances made for shifting cultivation under the directions of the divisional forest officers. Originally it was hard to get the Karens to fall in with the proposals of the Forest Department, but now they would think it a great hardship if deprived of this additional source of livelihood. At present, planting work is mainly confined to Burma and Bombay, where about 5,000 and 3,300 acres respectively are being added annually. There is therefore every likelihood that the future yield from such forests will be considerably larger than it now is, so that the requirements of unborn generations are by no means being lost sight of, or being left unprovided for.

Like the distribution and the character of the forests themselves, the life of the forest officer, viewed as a career, varies greatly; but it is ever full of interest to one having a taste for natural science and biology. Happy should he be, however, whose lot falls in the alpine and sub-alpine tracts of the Himalayas; but full of hardship it usually is to those who have to bear the heavy burden of hard work in the trying climate of the purely tropical provinces, often with a very moist, enervating, and malarious climate. There is far more work now to be done than in the olden days of about forty years ago, when Captain Forsyth wrote his fascinating work, *The Highlands of Central India*; and big-game shooting seldom comes within easy reach of an energetic forester of the modern school.

There still remains, it is true, the wild charm of tent-life in the woodlands, and the pleasure of cold, sharp evenings beside the bright and cheerful camp fire; but there are also many and great hardships that have to be endured in weary solitude during the scorching heat of the blazing tropical spring and the merciless summer. Sometimes, when one is forced to be walking during the hottest time of the day, as when inspecting fire-protection paths along which one may not be able to ride, the pulse goes up to 120 beats a minute, the intense heat and glare make one feel faint, giddy, and sick, and the tongue seems almost to stick to the roof of the mouth; but one must either do the work conscientiously or else shirk it ignobly, for there is no middle way. Sometimes, too, in the height of the hot weather, there is a great want of water; and one may even be forced to camp near buffalo wallows, where, by sinking little side-wells at a short distance from the muddy pool, one can barely scoop out sufficient fluid for camp cookery; and even such water, when boiled, filtered, then boiled

again, and used for making tea, may still be strongly tainted with the unpleasant odour of buffalo.

But, all the same, despite hardships, malaria, rather poor pay, and very inadequate pensions, the Indian Forest Service has never yet failed to attract to it men who have given of their best in the shape of hard and laborious work; and Mr. Morley's eulogy in his Budget speech epitomises the present result of these past efforts. The pay and the pension given to forest officers should, however, in common fairness, be identical with those given to the Public Works Department, that other branch of the administration to which the Indian Forest Service has most resemblance, and with which it can claim closest kinship. I would earnestly commend this suggestion to the Secretary of State's sense of justice, for the now long-deferred and long-expected improvement in both of these respects will only be consistent with the eloquent tribute he has paid to the work of the Forest Department.

J. NISBET.

'THE DECAY OF MANNERS'

THE famous *talons rouges*, which trod so firmly the steps of the guillotine, had danced in many a gavotte or minuet in the ballrooms of the Louvre or of Versailles; the snowy lace, which fell over hands white as any woman's, had often been turned back to give free play to a wrist firm as iron, and the white hands had saved their owner's life in many a hard-fought duel.

There was not a trace of effeminacy in those men; they went to their death smiling, as they had smiled so often at a jest in their Sovereign's drawing-rooms; if their attire were less brilliant than they could have wished, it was because their gaolers had torn their gold-embroidered coats from off their backs, and the proudest heads in France were held as erect as ever, though no longer covered by the hats with the sweeping feathers which had been doffed with such grace, in bows of such elegance, as no other generation has ever seen.

In that impressive moment of their lives, less than ever must there be the slightest lapse from the rigid etiquette of manners; though it be the last time that the snuffbox will be offered to anyone, there must be the same studied grace in the offering. The delicate flick from the handkerchief must not be forgotten, though the cambric shirt from which the grain of snuff is brushed will so soon be dyed crimson in the life-blood of its owner. As they had lived, so they died, perhaps the most perfect gentlemen the world has ever seen. Of them it might be said, not 'Manners makyth man,' but 'Manners *were* these men'; their manners were not something external assumed for the occasion and dropped, they were the expression of their inward refined selves; they are gone, and with them has been buried the secret of manners in their most perfect form. It is doubtful if any but a Latin or a Celtic race could ever have brought manners to such a high state of perfection. True, at one time Great Britain claimed to be the home of the 'first gentleman in Europe,' but we have no evidence that the rest of Europe admitted that claim, and it may have originated in our British belief that we can produce the best of everything, even of manners.

It was something to boast of to be the 'first gentleman in Europe,'

as at that time he would have to stand comparison with the men of the *Ancien Régime*, and it is doubtful whether he could have claimed to be anything more than *primus inter pares*, judged by such a standard. In the days of the Regency, and after, a very high standard of manners was maintained in this country, although less highly polished and ornate than in France and Spain; the reason being that British reserve which has always made Englishmen reluctant to express their innermost feelings.

Hence, though chivalry, courage, and courtesy have always been numbered among the virtues of a British gentleman, he has never given expression to them in quite the elaborate style favoured by his compeers abroad, and if he has thereby lost something in gracefulness, he has gained by the simple dignity more suitable to his nature. As long as he was clothed in satins and velvets, with lace *jabots* and ruffles, his powdered hair covered with a hat of graceful shape, he maintained a high standard of deportment. The much-maligned rapier, which was ever at his side, enforced politeness of a high order, as the least lapse from perfect civility exposed the offender to the risk of being called upon to answer for it with his life. But with the passing of the *tenue de cérémonie* has passed away the *cérémonie* as well. From manners superlative to manners comparative was a gradual change; latterly we have rushed from manners comparative to manners positive; we are now on the brink of manners negative, manners *nil*. We cannot, of course, expect the modern Englishman to sweep the ground with his top-hat, as his forefathers did with their plumed headgear, when he bows to a woman; but he really might show a little more deference than is expressed by a curious little jerk of the hat, so hastily replaced, probably for fear of catching cold. It would be hopeless to look for the same elaborate compliments from the young men of to-day as were paid by the *beaux* of a bygone age to the then reigning beauties; but they surely might find something a little more flattering to say of their hostesses than that 'they do you well'—a great compliment, of course, but less justly paid to the lady of the house than to her cook, and probably not even to her own private cook, but to the *chef* of the popular restaurant, where unwholesome food has been partaken of, in heterogeneous society, to the music of a conversation-killing band. In the early Victorian era, when man still wore a more or less formal costume, although the 'grand manner' was no more, there lingered yet a very perfect politeness; punctilious deference was shown by youth to old age, men still bowed low over a woman's hand, and she still curtsied—as well as a crinoline would allow her to.

Politeness was the distinguishing mark of those days; it was all that remained of a more ornate age. It was not beautiful or picturesque; it failed to appeal to the imagination; it was the jewel still, but the jewel in the rough, in an unbecoming setting; and men were already

chafing under a code which was restrictive while offering no compensations for obedience. Low murmurs of revolt began to be heard; muttered rebellion asked: 'Why should we do this? Why should we not do that?' Society had actually dared to question the validity of the social decalogue of manners! That class which was responsible for the making of the law was already asking if it was just; those on whom it depended for its maintenance were refusing to be bound by it. The code of manners, like the code of honour, is supported by no penal enactments; obedience must be voluntary: once question its decrees, and it ceases to be operative. That law, which up till then had been only one of the clauses of the more comprehensive law of Duty, dressed up in satin and laces, tricked out in powder and patches, had been subscribed to universally by the classes called gentle; now, in its unpicturesque garb of swallow-tailed coats and high stocks, it began to seem harsh and unlovely. Soon, too soon, it would pass through a still more unattractive stage, culminating in a *négligé* stage of dressing-gown and slippers, and manners are no more. There have probably been many contributory causes, other than changing fashions in dress, to account for the gradual falling away from grace. Nothing that is really beautiful can be achieved in a hurry; there is grace in movement, as there is grace in repose, but there is no grace in hurry. Shortly after the swallow-tail coat and high stock period came the invention of steam engines; with these began the age of hurry, the age of rush. If manners had not been already moribund the first steam engine would have killed them; people soon learned they had no time for them. A new era dawned; up till then men had time for everything that their station in life demanded of them; henceforward, the parrot-cry was to grow increasing in shrillness until the hateful words 'No time' became the motto of those whose ancestors' battle-cry was, '*For God and the King.*' The descendants of those who twined into their mottoes the noble words courage, loyalty, honour, now emblazon on their shields a motor-car *passant* on a field *or*, and their motto is 'Speed and gold.' The last thing cultivated, in these degenerate days, is repose, since repose is the essence of good manners. These relics of bygone ages had to go; their gentle life was cut short by 'electrocution,' a barbarous word fittingly describing a barbarous act. Chivalry made one last despairing fight for existence. When the seating accommodation on the underground railway was insufficient, many men gave up their seats to women, and hung suspended on a strap; but the railway company put on extra carriages, and man's last effort to be chivalrous was no longer called for.

For this deplorable state of affairs men are not alone responsible; women have much to answer for. About the time when man was becoming restive under the strict, but unattractive, code of some thirty

or forty years ago, women began to be alarmed. Something, clearly, was wrong. At Society's full-dress parades there were gaps in the ranks; the drawing-rooms of Mayfair and Belgravia began to suffer from the competition of the boudoirs of Brompton; manners *en négligé* were beginning to prove dangerously attractive to men who were tiring of manners in stiffly starched shirts. Two courses were open: to stand firm and refuse to yield an inch, or to parley with the enemy and make terms; not, of course, that there could be any parley between Belgravia and Brompton, but the former would not be above taking a hint from the latter. Slight modifications should be made in Society's Draconic code. For instance, concessions could be made as to the consumption of tobacco; less rigour should be shown in enforcing sartorial laws; some relaxation might be possible of the laws governing men's attitude in society. The inch was given, and the ell was soon taken; tobacco, once banished to gun-rooms or some dismal and distant room, now pervades the whole house. It is very comforting, and we should hate to have to submit to the old restrictions, but it is not conducive to polite manners. Then riding-breeches and a light jacket, with a straw hat on the head, are much more comfortable to ride in the Park on a summer day than were the pantaloons and frock coats of a preceding generation, but they bring with them a sense of ease and looseness, less suitable to the *haute école* than to the jog-trot of our present-day existence. It removes all uncomfortable feelings of restraint between a man and a woman when he calls her 'Lady Bill' or 'Mrs. Harry'; it establishes at once a pleasing sense of *camaraderie*; but it is not formal, and there must be a certain amount of formality in all good manners. The well-bred Englishman has the best manners in the world, when he chooses; he could not possibly be bad-mannered, but he is becoming so informal that a day may come when he will refuse to exchange the 'slippered ease' of the smoking-room for the comparatively strict decorum of the drawing-room. When that day dawns, doubtless woman will make things easy for him, by joining him in the smoking-room, if she has not already done so.

The growing cult of the informal is proved by the conversation of the present day. It is not only that subjects are now discussed openly which were once talked of only in the theatres of the hospital—a year or two ago an intimate knowledge of internal anatomy was a sure passport to favour at any dinner table—but the language of the day is slipshod, curt, and ugly. The fine English language is disfigured by many unpleasing transatlanticisms, concise and descriptive perhaps, suited to an age of rush and hurry, but let us hope that we shall be spared the crowning horror of seeing them spelt in American phonetic spelling. Perhaps that also will come, if it be proved that it saves time; we already owe to America the system of head-lines embodying

in a few sensational words the information contained in a brief paragraph, which is yet too long to be read by this time-pressed generation. Compression will soon be called for; people will demand that the small pill of fact shall be made up without any superfluous coating of grace of style in the narration of it. Utilitarianism reigns supreme; anything which cannot show practical proof of its usefulness is doomed; little wonder, then, that oratory is heard no more, except occasionally from an Irishman's lips, as the sister island is happily never in a hurry. The speeches of even the most eminent politicians are nothing but good sound businesslike arguments *pro* and *con.*, but there is not a trace in them of that classic turn, of that poetical spirit, of that command of English, which characterised the oratorical efforts of other days. Alas! it has also been reserved for the House of Commons of the present day to afford some of the most startling proofs of the grievous decay of manners.

It is not only in speech that there is this conspicuous lack of grace; in correspondence there is the same defect. No one now thinks of writing a letter which shall express thoughts and ideas in well-chosen language. The modern letter is brief and to the point; if the writer could compress its contents into a sixpenny telegram he would probably prefer to do so. Some men, who wish to appear busier than they are, are guilty of the unpardonable rudeness of sending type-written letters with the signature also typed. A particularly glaring instance was that of a man who replied to a letter of condolence from an old friend with a type-written acknowledgment! Postcards, often of the unpleasing pictorial kind, are some people's favourite medium of communication, not because they cost a halfpenny, but because they save time, and the writers grudge the extra minute or two required to send the more polite form of correspondence, a letter.

Hurry and Bridge have killed the art of polite conversation; hurry has robbed correspondence of its grace; hurry is fast transforming the once sedate city of London into a pandemonium of whirring noises, whirling wheels, and evil fumes. The once quiet grey streets are now disfigured with huge blocks of buildings, copied from America, built on American plans, which spring up like gigantic mushrooms in a night. All the earth underneath the metropolis is tunnelled with electric railways, carrying rushing crowds from one end of the town to the other, while the surface of the earth is shaken with the throbbing of huge electric Juggernauts. Dignity, grace, repose, are banished from our midst; and we are—as yet—only at the beginning of this break-neck race through life. Perhaps some generation yet to come will read the history of our days; some dusty memoirs of our period will cause the men and women of the future to say, 'Those people were very punctilious, very slow, very sedate.' That may be the opinion held in the not very far distant days when contending

aeroplanes crash into one another without an apology, and myriads of motor-cars sweep over the prostrate bodies of pedestrians without inquiring if they are hurt. But there will be less difference between the people of that day and the people of ours than there is between us and the powdered courteous gallants and dames who worthily upheld the traditions of good manners, when the first gentleman in Europe was 'the glass of fashion and the mould of form.'

ADOLPHUS 'VANE TEMPEST.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE 'EX'

It was at an Academy private view that it was brought forcibly to my notice. A lady and a gentleman were about to mount the stairs when the man detached himself and went back to an elderly man, who stood apart from the crowd, and greeted him with genial warmth. He shook the elderly man's hand with an exaggerated effusiveness by which he tried hard to cover the embarrassment he felt on having his kindly greeting met with an icy stare. The elderly man having paralysed the too cordial one, the too cordial one stammered, and retreated to his companion still waiting for him on the stairs. She received him with chaffing contempt.

'At any rate, I wouldn't be snubbed by an "ex,"' was her odd greeting.

'Poor old boy, I am sorry for him,' the snubbed one said good-naturedly, 'he is taking it hard. I don't mind.'

Whereupon they climbed up the red stairs, and forgot the snub, because, after all's said and done, in society the snub of an 'ex' doesn't hurt much.

I looked meditatively at the elderly man, who still stood gloomily waiting, and solved at once the riddle of the 'ex,' for I recognised in him a man who had been great, wielding a world-wide influence, the kind of influence that made Cabinet Ministers willing to wait on his front doorsteps, if he happened to be out, while duchesses positively enjoyed his being rude to them, and unassorted celebrities were to him as God had made them—that is, natural. Then, suddenly, something happened. The lever by which he moved the world was taken from his grasp—a younger man got it. So one tragic day he found himself reduced to the rank of an 'ex.' The world is full of the tragedy of the 'ex,' melancholy, resentful human beings on whom the door of Paradise has closed with a bang.

Once, in her old and lonely age, I met a very great lady who in her brilliant and happy past had had the whole world at her feet. It was said of her, as the crown and summit of her glory, that she had succeeded in making one of the greatest men of his day very unhappy for a whole year. Of course it takes a woman to appreciate fully the satisfactory nature of this achievement. When I saw her

she was very old and ill, and helpless, and quite alone in the world, though in a palace. Thinking, womanlike, of the famous man she had made unhappy fifty years before, I said, not finding anything comforting to say of her present :

'How happy you must be to think of your beautiful past.'

Whereupon she looked at me with her weary, faded eyes, and replied with a kind of hopeless impatience :

'Have you ever found anyone who is really grateful for a happy past that's gone for ever ?'

I then realised, as I have again and again, the justice of fate which punishes with a profound and lasting regret those who have had too much of good fortune in their life.

Just now society is teeming with the 'ex' as never before. M.P.s and Cabinet Ministers and even greater ones yet swell the ranks of the unemployed. It must be a curious Arabian Night kind of feeling, given to few, to be one day a ruler of millions, hedged about by the pomp of kings, and the next day, possibly, to be climbing a London penny 'bus, unmolested and unnoticed except by the conductor, who says benevolently, ''Old tight, sir.' Of such are the dramas of democracy. But, indeed, life is so crowded with great dramas that the world hasn't time to waste much thought on any one. Probably your private tragedy looms very large to you, but do not make the foolish mistake to imagine that it looms very large to anyone else. Your neighbour's pin-prick engrosses him much more than your tragedy next door.

The disadvantage of climbing high is that you can fall so much farther, and that hurts. Happy are those who stand on the safe level of the unaspiring, for that, though they don't usually know it, constitutes their splendid solace. It is a great and supreme art to climb down from a height so gently and unobtrusively that nobody notices you, so that wherever you may ultimately find yourself, the world accepts you as a matter of course, and is not amused. It takes great heroism to accept the inevitable with grace and dignity, and not to make the world smile.

The tragedy of the 'ex' is the universal human tragedy, but, somehow, one does not bring it home to oneself. Who ever thinks that his day is over ? No one. One's talent, success, aspirations are in one's own estimation immortal. If one had the ghost of a doubt, how differently one would act ! There is a climax to every man's career, be he ever so great, and no man can escape the sympathy or neglect of the world. It is a question which hurts most. The only human attribute, it would seem, that outlives the final tragedy of time, is character. A great statesman undoubtedly outlives his usefulness ; a great financier will find the time come when younger brains will outwit his, weary and worn with the eternal and futile struggle for wealth and recognition. A great painter will reach

a time when his eyes and his faithful hands become tired; and the poet, too, will find his imagination unresponsive to spurring. Even the greatest scientists have to make way for newer discoverers. What we call knowledge is but a stepping-stone to the eternal truths. And in due time, the stepping-stones having served their turn, they lose all their value, except an historical one. But the saint remains a saint long after his eyes close in death, and his memory and influence live on, and time is powerless to hurt them. The goodness, the uprightness, the splendid example of men and women, those only are immortal, as Heaven—not the world—understands immortality.

I remember being shown through the great library at Christ Church, Oxford, by a distinguished professor of history. He pointed out some old tomes piled in a corner, and sumptuous in mediæval binding.

'They're to be turned out,' he said regretfully, 'we need the room. They have served their day, and are valuable only as curiosities. Their wisdom, in the light of modern research, has become folly.'

It was profoundly startling to hear that even wisdom may become antiquated; that the value it has is for ever changing, for ever being modified in the light of a profounder knowledge.

There is nothing so impatient and uncharitable as youth, and it is youth that forgets the soonest. So no wonder that in a young country men and women get shelved soonest, and join the ranks of the 'ex.' The world is going at a fearfully rapid pace, and we get to the end of our careers in a deplorably short time, and nowhere, it would seem, in so short a time as in America. Memory in America is tragically short, in the same proportion as its sense of reverence is tragically deficient. It is a curious study, this America, with its tremendous reverence for all things that are very ancient, in contrast to its lack of reverence for a human being who is merely old. Though English society is just now crowded with the 'ex,' there is in spite of that no quality that strikes the social student more than the sturdy loyalty characteristic of the English. The Englishman is nothing if not loyal. Possibly it is a part of his intense conservatism; but, at any rate, it is there. There is nothing volatile about him, and so he misses the charm of the lighter temperament, but also its defects. Know him, and, if he likes you, you know him once for all. He does not change, and—here is the defect of his nature—often enough he refuses to acknowledge that the world changes, nor does he always realise its gigantic progress. He who is the mightiest founder of empires is in this twentieth century in a fair way to be left behind by his own children, in whom he sowed the seeds of progress, enlightenment, and ambition. Who has not seen a big, splendid man pathetically true to the scraggy, elderly love of his youth, admiring her grey curls, and those side-laced boots which encase her elderly and

solid ankles? Somehow this picture is so typically English. Constancy is never far from a touch of sentimentality, and there are no people quite so sentimental as the English. Experience teaches one that the keener and more hard-headed a man is, the more Nature attempts to recover her balance by making him profoundly sentimental.

What other nation but the English could produce the rapturous audiences of the Ballad Concerts, where, year in and year out, they listen to the feeblest of verses married to the feeblest of music, and sung by the old, old favourites? What other people but the English remain so true to what has once given them joy? To the sturdy, honest, middle-class Englishman, with no knowledge but a great deal of emotion, for which he has no adequate outlet, the art of his youth he loyally loves to the day of his death—the art which suffuses his cold blue eyes with a haze of tears, and makes his constant heart beat a little faster beneath his immaculate shirt-front. He does not understand the dramatic emotions of the volatile Frenchman or Italian; in fact, he not only abhors them, but he is ashamed of them. Yet his inward sobs are very real, if unheard, when an aged songstress, connected also with the beautiful days of his youth, carols forth 'Where is poor mother now?'

In his constancy he is quite devoid of humour; in fact, the Englishman dreads humour. He who has, by some curious freak of Nature, as a nation, given the world its greatest humorists, is as an individual afraid of it. And, indeed, he is more afraid of laughter than he is of tears. In fact, if he had more humour, it would have had a wholesome effect on British art, and by-and-by he would cease to love the feeble.

The Victorian age, besides its phase of greatness, had a phase of mediocrity, which, had it not been so funny, would have been appalling. It was undoubtedly the bread-and-butter era of the arts, and the immortal Nine for many a long year did outrage to their feelings by wearing Balmoral skirts, hoops, side-elastic boots, 'spit-curls,' a 'water-fall,' and exhibited virtues which, it is to be feared, were not always characteristic of them; while their near relatives, the three Graces, in deference to the young person with a cheek too prone to blush, arrayed their Greek legs in British pantalets. The old lessons of the Victorian age are still not quite forgotten—so loyal are the English!—and if the Muses and the Graces are not entirely draped in Victorian garments, they are, as it were, still adorned with the British pantalets, and so the middle-class English love to see them.

Heine—studying the Englishman through a medium of fog and antagonism—declares him to be the most arrant of hypocrites; in which he is quite wrong. The middle-class Englishman—and, be it said with gratitude, he represents the real nation—is only sentimental, intensely respectable, and also very prudish. And he it is

who still forms public opinion. The highest classes may assimilate the worst vices of other nations, and contribute their own share, but these evils do not affect the class that is respectable as well as sentimental, and one can be both and yet not be a hypocrite. Heine, that arch-wit, conscious of the English national lack of humour, in a cynical moment branded a whole nation with an undeserved epithet, forgetting that the wrong done by a great poet is immortal. The land of the 'shocked' and the 'shocking' could not be sympathetic to a poet whose lexicon of youth contained neither word. He gave them credit for neither sincerity nor feeling, these English who, if they cannot quite resist the electric spirit of the age whose motto is 'forget,' can still be depended on more than other people to be faithful to old favourites, even when these have ceased to deserve it. All the same, the tragedy of the 'ex' is the universal tragedy; at best it is only delayed.

But the perfection and haste of forgetting is undoubtedly American. I remember a very characteristic incident. Some years ago an author emerged out of obscurity, and suddenly shone in America as a star of the first magnitude. Society in Boston went quite mad over her, with the result that the young lion developed a bad case of swelled head. One day I met an old friend in the street, one of the band of modern hero-worshippers who lay flowers and 'candy' on the shrine of the latest lion. I observed that she bore a card-case and was distinctly subdued.

'Where have you been?' I asked politely.

'I've been to call on ——,' and she mentioned the young lion's name, 'and oh!' she cried in a sudden outburst of indignation, 'how she did snub me! I'd be ashamed to treat a worm so!'

'Serves you right for calling on a lion,' was my comment.

It was about a year after that I again met her, and again she was armed with a card-case.

'Where are you going?' I asked.

'To leave a card on Miss ——,' and she again named the same lion. 'I'm sure nobody else will, for this year everybody's running after ——,' and she mentioned the very latest thing in lions, 'and so I thought she'd be real lonely, and glad to have my card.'

Whereupon she proceeded on her benevolent errand.

I recognise the familiar national trait with a sense of melancholy amusement. The rapturous enthusiasm with which Americans take up anything new, be it a man or a woman, a religion or a patent medicine, an art or a liver-pill, or anything else that appeals to their many-faceted natures, must seek for balance by an equally rapid forgetting. Not that it is, of course, only American, but it is essentially American. The greatest man in America, whose name fills all the papers and is on every tongue, who looms so large that he blots out even the most distinguished men about him, will yet find

his Nemesis in that American memory which does not even wait—far from it!—for a tombstone to cover his last resting-place. For no matter how great a man is, there is always some one who thinks, or whose friends think, that he is as great, if not possibly greater, and so there is always some one waiting with unconcealed impatience for his empty shoes while he still has them on. Whereupon, the shoes being finally empty, the famous man who once wore them becomes an 'ex,' and such future career as is left to him is suffocated by his distinguished past as by a mountainous feather-bed.

It is enough to study the careers of the ex-Presidents of the United States to realise the phenomenal brevity of the American memory—that is, during life. Sometimes, after they are dead, they have a renaissance of appreciation. As for Vice-Presidents, they are forgotten while still in office. Occasionally one emerges from the singular obscurity of his exalted position by disaster to his chief; but unless such a chance arises many an able but bothersome man, who cannot be overlooked by party politics, has been nicely buried in that distinguished office which is only next in unimportance to the silent tomb.

It was within three months of the assassination of President McKinley that an Englishman of my acquaintance called upon him. In the course of the conversation he expressed to Mr. McKinley the universal regret felt here at the loss to Great Britain by the departure of that distinguished statesman Mr. John Hay, who had resigned his position as Ambassador to England to become Secretary of State. The Englishman seemed to think that not only England but Mr. Hay was the loser.

'To be Ambassador to England is of course the greatest office in your gift,' he said, conscious that there is only one England.

'No,' the President replied, 'it is a much greater position to be Secretary of State. He comes next in importance to the President.' Here he paused and then added casually, as an afterthought which had nearly escaped him, 'I mean, of course, with the exception of the Vice-President.'

Three months after the Vice-President, who in the enumeration had been so nearly overlooked, took up the reins of government. It was, of course, Mr. Roosevelt.

It does seem as if the United States could make more worthy use of many a distinguished 'ex.' By the time their statesmen have become profoundly versed in the science of statecraft they are relegated to oblivion, instead of having their tried wisdom still employed in the councils of the nation. There comes a time in the lives of great statesmen when circumstances deprive them of the ordinary outlets of ambition at the very moment when it would seem that their impartial services would be of vast value to the nation. But so far the highest in the land cannot escape the universal tragedy. However, there is no profession, no art, no position in life which can escape that doom. In

contradiction to that mistaken pronouncement of the Declaration of Independence that we are all born free and equal, one can only be absolutely sure that we die free and equal. When we are born we are at once bound by unbreakable chains. We are all slaves of our environment, slaves of inherited disease, slaves of inherited unintelligence, slaves of inherited good or evil tendencies, and such we remain until we die, and only then are we free and equal—free from the chains that bound us, and which made us the helpless playthings of destiny, and equal in our helplessness one to the other.

The longer one lives and observes how each life, however great or however modest, has its climax of usefulness, the more one is struck by the folly of the human attitude towards humanity. There is no human being, however great, who is not at the mercy of some other man; or supposing he is not—which is, however, inconceivable—then he is at the mercy of some inherited disease. Or, supposing that he has no disease which may make him curse his forbears, he is at any rate at the mercy of natural laws, and he must inevitably die. For laws are even greater than the God who has made them. A tap on the head, or a fatal disease, will make even an Emperor a pitiable thing with whom no healthy beggar would change destinies. It is melancholy to think how faint is the boundary line between ourselves and destruction. To contemplate the loftiness with which the human being promenades on the brink of the precipice into which, sooner or later, he is destined to tumble! How little it takes to swell the average human being's head! How proud he is of his little intellect, his big bank account, his social position, or any other thing by which he can proclaim his superiority (God save the mark!) to his fellow worm! If the Supreme Power, who is responsible for human laughter as well as human tears, has a sense of humour, how grimly He must be amused at the airs and the eternal fierce conflicts of the little creatures who grub in this familiar ant-hill! Nor is it one of the least of the tragedies of our existence that we waste our few measured hours on trivialities. It is only at the end of life, when the little remaining sand in the hour-glass runs with appalling swiftness, that we realise the preciousness of the hours that will never return. To meditate on the chances that we once had, but which we have had to relinquish, is the intimate tragedy of the 'ex.' Every dog has his day, but, alas! it is only a day.

This electric age is the age of youth. Every man is being understudied by some aspiring youngster who, in his own imagination, has shelved his chief, while that unconscious man still thinks that the world cannot possibly do without him. Now there is no man so great but the world can do perfectly well without him. It is one of the profoundly wise provisions of Nature that no man is missed because he is merely important. Youth is constantly at the heels of age, and clamours insistently for recognition, and it is only the narrow

and the foolish who refuse it. I was struck by the remark of a clever and thoughtful man, to whose attention the somewhat preposterous claims of a group of talented but untried youngsters had been brought. Instead of agreeing with the rather scornful reference to their unreasonable demands, considering their youth and inexperience, he said: 'You forget. These boys are destined to be the great men of the future.' How many of us think that?

If youth is often uncharitable to age, age is often enough blind to the claims of youth. It is rather difficult to realise that the youth whose ears one has cuffed in early days has claims to one's profound admiration. No man ever was a hero to his valet, and age knows youth too well to take it seriously.

To what mother does her child ever grow old? No matter how famous the child. It is so hard to lay aside the old habit of authority, even when the child has grey hair, and is starting on the downward path. Perhaps of all the tragedies none is more painful than the irrevocable one, when the parent realises that the child has ceased to be dependent on him for advice, if not for sympathy. It does seem as if the wise recognition that one's day of usefulness has a limit, and that it is only fair to give another man a chance, should influence our attitude to other human beings. It ought to make for a friendly humility, for a wider charity, for a profounder sense of human brotherhood. When a king dies, he dies to all intents and purposes in no other way than the poorest outcast in his kingdom; he has entered the republic of death, and he is an ex-king. The richest man in the world cannot, at the price of all his wealth, buy one single heart-beat more from destiny. The wisdom of the greatest intellect cannot obtain for its possessor the respite of another instant of time. Would it not seem natural if this universal helplessness, which spares no one, should be a bond to make us profoundly tolerant one to the other, profoundly charitable? Instead, one is amazed at the mean and trivial standards by which human beings judge each other, as well as at the tragic importance they attach to what is of colossal unimportance. Do we not judge our fellow-creatures by their clothes, their right or their wrong religion, their cleverness, their success, their wealth and their social position? Society, on the brink of the universal precipice, runs after the bad man with influence, after the rich man whose riches are tainted, after the man of rank with neither intellect nor character.

The truth is the world has ceased to have any convictions, and martyrdom is dreadfully out of fashion. We have so much to think of that we don't think at all. The martyrs believed in some one thing profoundly; we haven't time or conviction enough to think of anything profoundly, for the world clamours for our attention in a hundred thousand different ways every moment of time. We believe only in the material aspects of life and faith; our creed is to have

only faith in what we can see and prove. So we have great scientists, but no martyrs. The martyrs were the scientists of the ideal, but ideality, like poets and martyrs, is of a bygone age.

No, not even women are able to escape the tragedy of the 'ex.' Who has not watched a beautiful woman grow old? That tragedy at least is spared a plain woman. Put a pair of spectacles on your plain nose and who cares? But when the loveliest eyes in the world hide behind glasses—that is indeed a woman's tragedy.

To fall from great beauty, great wealth, great power, great position—to realise, if you only can, that, in short, you have come to the end—is the supreme tragedy of life, and proves the benevolence of destiny towards those who are nothing in particular; and who therefore escape the doom of falling so far. Perhaps the acutest suffering for the prominent 'ex' is that he has to suffer in public, and we all have that in common with the noble savage, that when we suffer we prefer to retire from view. To suffer in the curious eyes of the world is to suffer doubly. It is hard and undignified, if not impossible, to push one's way to the front again, to the place one once occupied, through a mob of clamouring youngsters, who bar one's path. The consolation for all must be that it is everybody's destiny sooner or later. What use to rebel? Look, rather, with profound and amused philosophy at Arrogance that elbows its way through the world as if there were no bad fairy with a wand waiting for it at the end to turn it into an 'ex.'

Would it not be well in the day of triumph to think of the inevitable future? To be not only great but civil? To be famous and yet not devoured by conceit? To appreciate a great position at its full worth and yet not to be a snob? Not to judge success by the standard of mere wealth?

One offers these modest suggestions to the rich and great and famous, because who of us has not suffered from the rich, the great and the famous? After all, even these are all destined to be back numbers sooner or later. Why not consider the probability of being a back number in the heyday of life, when your natural instinct is, of course, to snub your fellow-men? Even the greatest of you would be wise to be somewhat modest, for the inexorable motto of this world is 'The King is dead! Long live the King!'

And who ever bothers about a dead king!

ANNIE E. LANE.

THE MARRIAGE OF PELEUS AND THETIS

(*AFTER CATULLUS, CARMEN LXIV*)

.

And when the Gods, on thrones of ivory couched,
Had gathered round the marriage feast, bespread
With ample fare and dainties manifold,
Behold! the Fates, the Sisters Three, drew near:
Their limbs swayed feebly with the weight of years,
Their mystic voices chanted words of sooth.

Clad in white raiment were those tremulous forms,
Fringes of purple circled round their feet,
And rosy chaplets bound their snow-white locks.
Their hands, as ever, span the Eternal Task,
And one, the left, held high a distaff, swathed
With fleecy wool; the other deftly drew
The limber thread, which upturned fingers shaped:
Whilst now and then a downward thumb would drive
The spindle, with its balanced disc, a-whirl.
And alway, as they worked and worked, their teeth
Would shear the yarn, and smooth the fretted strands,
Whereof the woolly tags that flecked the thread
Clove, as they plucked them, to their withered lips,
While creels of osier harboured at their feet
The tempered fleeces, twined in silvery spheres.
And as they span, lo! from their shrilly throats
Poured forth the Song of Fate, a song so true
That never man shall dare in after years
To call it counterfeit—and thus they sang:

I.

Warden of Emathian splendour, famous in thy famous seed,
Thou who crownest matchless honours with the might of doughty deed!
On this day of glad espousals to the Ancient Sisters list,
Listen to their words of cunning, while the spindles turn and twist.
Twist and turn, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

II.

Hesperus approaches, Peleus, laden with thy dreams' delight,
'Tis thy bride that Hesper bringeth with the happy Star of Night;
She her gentle arms shall circle round thy mighty neck, and steep
All thy senses in love's languor, as ye softly sink to sleep.
Twine and turn, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

III.

Bridegroom, such a love as thine is, never homestead nestled round,
Never love such perfect lovers in the links of passion bound.
Such a love has come to Thetis, such a love has Peleus found.
Whirl and whirl, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

IV.

Ye shall have a son, Achilles, fearless-hearted, whom the foe
Ever by his gallant onset, never by his flight shall know;
Champion of a thousand races, whom the swiftest may not tire,
Victor of the antlered quarry, though its foot be fleet as fire!
Turn and turn, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

V.

Peerless amid warrior heroes—they shall vie with him in vain
When the Trojan blood like water floods across the Phrygian plain,
When the heir of perjured Pelops, triple wearer of the crown,
After lingering years of battle, ravages the Trojan town.
Turn and turn, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

VI.

Hoary heads of childless matrons, locks dishevelled and unbound,
Feeble palms wan bosoms smiting, faces bowed unto the ground,
All acclaim thy might, Achilles, hail the glory thou shalt gain,
In the funeral rites of anguish for the sons thy bow has slain.
Twist and twine, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

VII.

As the reaper with his sickle lops the wheat-ears one by one,
As he mows the corn that glitters in the splendour of the sun,
So hereafter shall Achilles, with an unrelenting sword,
Strew the field with Trojan corses, harvests of the Trojan horde.
Turn and turn, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

VIII.

Witness of his mighty prowess, swift Scamander, thou shalt be,
Thou who pourest troubled waters in the Hellespontine Sea,
For a myriad slain shall straiten all the channel of thy flood,
And thy torrent seethe and crimson with a tide of Trojan blood.
Turn and turn, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

IX.

Ay, and thou shalt be a witness, maiden, with thy latest breath,
When thy snowy limbs lie stricken in the sacrifice of death,
When the funeral mound is builded, and thy virgin blood is shed,
Where the hero's shrine awaits thee with the welcome of the dead.
Twist and twine, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

X.

For when laggard fortune brightens and the weary Greeks behold
How the battlements are broken that Poseidon built of old,
Then to do thee grace, Achilles, goes the victim to her doom,
And Polyxena shall suffer, kneeling at thy lofty tomb,
Fall a headless corse before thee, she who erst had been thy wife,
And the royal blood of Priam stain the sacrificial knife.
Whirl and whirl, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

XI.

Wherefore come, O bride and bridegroom, ye have fretted at delay,
Let your inmost spirits mingle in the rapture of to-day.
Take at last in happy bondage, Peleus, this thy Goddess bride,
Yield, and seek thy place, O Thetis, by a yearning lover's side.
Turn and turn, O Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

XII.

When to-morrow with the dawning, maiden, comes thy nurse of yore,
She shall find the vestal fillet compassing thy throat no more.
Twine and twine, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

XIII.

Never shall thy mother, weeping, hopeless for a passion sped,
Lack thy children's love, O Thetis, driven from a husband's bed.
Turn and turn, ye Spindles Three: spin the Thread of Destiny.

Thus on a time the Sisters Three foretold
Peleus his fate with mystic words of sooth,
And sang glad tidings of the after years;
For in those ancient days, or ever man
His bounden homage scorned, the Folk of Heaven
Vouchsafed their presence bodily on earth,
Now, manifest amid the common throng,
Now, in the halls where stainless Heroes dwelt.

BURGHCLERE.

MONTENEGRO

MONTENEGRO is, let us say it boldly, one of the most fascinating corners of Europe. Where else will you find a citadel which for five hundred years defied a whole Empire seventeen times, nay a hundred and seventy times, its size? Where else will you find a race of warriors who for three hundred and fifty years were ruled and led to battle by a bishop; or a people whose ancestors could claim no less than sixty-three victories in twelve years against armies outnumbering them ten or twenty or a hundred times; a people who still wear a black band to mourn their kindred who died on the field of Kossovo—that greater Flodden, when the flower of Slav Christendom fell before the advancing hordes of Islam, more than five centuries ago? Where else will you find a Prince who still wears the beautiful national dress of his country, who knows half his subjects by sight, who for fifty years has himself settled their disputes before his palace door, and who has led his troops to victory in person?

But the Montenegro of to-day is not wholly the Montenegro that inspired the finest of Tennyson's sonnets or the scarcely less glowing eulogies of Mr. Gladstone thirty years ago. The spirit of change has at last touched the Black Mountain, which had so long been the stronghold of unaltered traditions. The last Plantagenet was reigning in England when a handful of Christian Serbs first set up, on the wild rocks of their natural citadel, the standard of faith and freedom, which their descendants have ever since defended against overwhelming odds, with scarcely a decade's peace, down to our own days. But by the Treaty of Berlin, that last great landmark for good and evil in Balkan history, the independence of the little State—Montenegro is even now not quite so large as Yorkshire, and her population is about the same as that of Leicester—was recognised 'by the Sublime Porte and by all such of the high contracting parties as had not already admitted it,' and since that time 'the swarm of Islam' has no longer surged against the 'rough rock throne of freedom.' Peace came where for centuries there had been no peace, and settled boundaries, elaborated by commissions, took the place of that debatable territory which had been equally the cause and the result of border raids. The Montenegrin had no longer to fight for the bare rocks of the Black

Mountain, and, more than that, the fertile level country around it became his recognised and rightful property. In old days, when the miserable patches of soil, some of them only a few feet square, where the peasant raised his scanty crop between the stones, had yielded an unusually poor return, it had always been possible to retrieve a bad harvest by a raid into the more fruitful plains belonging to Turkish neighbours. But now the mountaineer must himself become an agriculturist, and industry must take the place of daring and valour. It may be doubted whether the change was altogether welcome. The raising of potatoes and maize and tobacco, or of goats and cattle, must lack variety for a nation of born fighters, when it is unrelieved, year after year, by any call to arms against the Turk, or even by the excitement of a blood feud with a neighbouring village.

As soon as the frontiers and status of Montenegro were established, Prince Nicholas set himself to obtain for his people the usual benefits of a civilised State. Provision has been made for elementary and secondary education; there are a few hospitals and many churches now in the country; a daily post comes to Cettinje, and there is telegraphic communication between all the chief places. Good driving roads connect Cettinje with the Austrian port of Cattaro and the Montenegrin port of Antivari, and with the towns of Podgoritza, Danilograd, and Nikshitch, and other roads, which will open up the forests of Eastern Montenegro, are in the process of making. The imports of Montenegro, which in 1905 amounted to about 194,000*l.*, then exceeded her exports—cattle, smoked mutton, potatoes, and tobacco—by about 120,000*l.* Her total revenue is about 124,000*l.*[1] There is—there has always been—absolute security for the traveller by day or by night. 'Mais ce n'est pas là mon mérite,' the Prince said to me, speaking of this fact, 'ni le mérite de mon gouvernement; c'est inné du peuple même. We should never dare to make laws for the protection of strangers, for to do so would insult my people. Never in all the history of Montenegro has there been a case when a stranger, who has come among us in kindness, has been insulted or injured.'

The publication of the Civil Code in 1888 was a landmark in the history of Montenegrin progress. Certain laws had, it is true, been written down in 1796, during the reign of the Vladika St. Peter, and Danilo the First had, in 1855, produced the Code which bears his name. This collection of laws was incomplete and almost haphazard, but it is interesting because of the light it throws on the life and character of the people. Theft, cowardice, and immorality—these are the vices that seem blackest to the Montenegrin; the thief must be beaten with many stripes, or even put to death; the woman who stole from her husband three times might be divorced; the coward was to be girt with a woman's apron and driven from the country by women with

[1] Montenegrin statistics are, however, somewhat vague.

their spindles; the punishment for immorality was death, in the woman's case by stoning.

Prince Nicholas knew his country too well to think of importing a ready-made and totally inappropriate civil code from abroad; and the Code of 1888 is a crystallisation, as it were, of the customs of the people, changing and adding as little as possible, though at the same time bringing these customs into harmony with sound general principles. The work was ably carried out by Professor Bogisic, the most learned, probably, of Southern Slavs, whose services were lent to the Prince for the purpose by the Czar Alexander the Second. It was the first time a trained legal mind had been brought to bear on the subject of Montenegrin law, and the task involved many years' close study of the unwritten customs of the country; but the Code, which is framed in simple language—for at that time Montenegro could boast of no trained lawyers to administer it—has been found to work admirably. The sections most interesting to an outsider relate to two institutions, which, though not peculiar to Montenegro, found, formerly, a very complete development there; that is, the Kutcha and the Pleme, the house community and the clan.

The house community, or Zadruga, is, or was, common to all the Southern Slavs, but it is unknown in Russia; it finds a counterpart in the village communities of Rajpootana, and Professor Bogisic, who is the chief authority on these subjects, has recently traced a like institution among the Kabyles of North Africa. Roughly speaking, the idea of the Kutcha is that the members of one family, it may be to the third and fourth generation, hold all their property in common; the proceeds of their labour, except under special circumstances, go into the general stock; any male member who wishes to leave the community, or even if he is expelled from it, must have his equal share given him. The Zadruga is not by any means the patriarchal institution it was once supposed to be; it is rather an example of a pure democracy; the Stareshina or Headman is elected, and may be deposed by the community; his sphere of action is strictly limited, and he can do little without the advice of the other members; while his share in the general stock is no larger than theirs. The position of woman in a Zadruga is curious: her larger claims are denied; but, as compensation apparently, she is granted certain small privileges. Where only daughters are left in a family they may inherit their father's property; but where there are sons, the daughters inherit nothing; on the other hand, brothers are bound to find husbands for their sisters, and to provide them with a portion. A girl in a Zadruga has a right to such jewellery, linen, clothes, and presents, as may come to her; whereas males may claim absolutely nothing as their own, without the express sanction of the other members of the community. The woman's special property remains her own after marriage, and her right to dispose of it, even without her husband's consent, is carefully safeguarded.

the same contradictions.
daughter's birth: 'Pardon me, pardon me,
husband to pass his wife on the road without sign of
but the law compelled the priest, three days before her marriage,
ask the woman if she was satisfied with her bridegroom. The honour
of women has always been sacred in Montenegro, and it is not her
least glory that the Turkish women and children who came to her as
refugees always found safety and kindness in the Black Mountain,
and the women who shared—as what Montenegrin women did not?—
in the hardships of war are honoured in song and story; while it was
for the sake of a woman that, in 1516, the last Prince of the Crnoievitch
Dynasty gave over the charge of his dominions to Bishop Babylas,
the first of the long line of prince bishops, and for the sake of a woman
that three hundred and fifty years later the ruler of Montenegro
abandoned his spiritual functions.

The Pleme or Clan has played an important part in Montenegrin history; it consists of a collection of families claiming descent from a common ancestor, who own certain lands in common, and who are bound to afford each other mutual help and protection, and to take vengeance on another clan which may have injured one of their number. Each clan formed a separate community, ruled by its own voivod, though, when the country was threatened by a common danger, the clans dropped their blood feuds for the moment to take arms under the leadership of the Vladika against the Turk. Until the time of Peter the Second (1830–1851) no Vladika was powerful enough to actually collect a tax from the clans, though more than one tax had been nominally imposed; and it was Peter the Second also who devised an expedient to check the blood feuds. Criminals were condemned to be shot by a number of men who were chosen from various clans, and who fired at the same time, no one of whom could, therefore, be marked out for vengeance by the criminal's family, and the creation of a bodyguard, chosen in the same way, served the same end. Severe sentences of banishment on unduly powerful members of clans and the institution of the Kapitans or local magistrates—many of whom are now well-educated and capable men—have done much to break their power.

But the clan feeling still exists. The frontier troubles, which come as regularly as the harvest or the tax collector, are often due to the vengeance taken by Montenegrins on Turks or Albanians who have murdered a clansman living in Old Servia or Albania. Last summer the disturbances were perpetual, and threatened to become serious; but it was difficult to learn what was really taking place. At Priepolie, one of the three Austrian garrisons in that strange anomaly, the sandjak of Novibazar, a few hours from the scene of the troubles, Austrian officers said cynically: 'All that we know is, that the

Turkish troops went out with new shoes and came back a few weeks later barefoot.' The Turks on their side asserted that the Montenegrins had encouraged their relations in Old Servia to refuse to pay their taxes, that troops had to be called out to collect them, and that the Christian villagers, most unnecessarily, the Turks said, became alarmed and fled across the frontier into Montenegro. In any case, pourparlers ensued, the peasants were induced to return to their villages, and were promptly massacred by the Turkish troops. Here was material enough for private vengeance, for Montenegro, under her present prudent Government, does not now charge headlong into war as she was once wont to do.

A curious light was, however, thrown on the still unchanged conditions of life by the following incident. Three boys were returning to their homes in Montenegro from Uskrüb, in Macedonia, where they had just finished their studies with great success at the Servian gymnasium. They were near the frontier when some Albanians fell on them, killing one child, while the others barely escaped with their lives, wounded and robbed, to tell the story. 'It is a sad thing,' said a charming and intelligent Montenegrin official, 'for the poor boy who was killed was very promising, and his parents had spent all they had to give him a good education. But the worst of it is, he belonged to a very large family; now, if it had been a small family, we could easily have put them all in prison, till the thing had blown over a little; but we cannot manage to put a large clan in prison, and we are afraid they will be over the border, taking vengeance and involving us in yet more difficulties with Turkey.' Imprisonment of the bereaved relations would have been a curious form of consolation at the hands of the paternal Government, and I was glad, I admit, that the clan, because it was a large one, was to have its chance—the only chance that existed—of bringing the murderers to justice.

Not the least remarkable change that Prince Nicholas has effected is in the military organisation of his country. Hitherto, the army had consisted of the 'whole nation under arms,' and their arms had been, characteristically enough, only the weapons they had taken from their Turkish prisoners or from the slain on the field; courage and practical experience and the natural advantages of their position had taken the place of regular training and modern equipment. But in Prince Mirko's recent wars with the Turks, although they had always been successful, the Montenegrins had suffered heavily, and it was clear that if they hoped to hold their own against the improvement in equipment and discipline which had taken place in the Turkish army since the Crimea, they, too, must move with the times, and, above all, furnish themselves with artillery. The great difficulty was want of money; the experiment of a standing army of any size had for this reason to be abandoned, and there are now only three permanent battalions and a pioneer company stationed at different places;

but the whole country is divided into military districts, and it is estimated that a force of 36,000 men could be put in the field at a few hours' notice, while by the purchase or gift of rifles and heavy guns from foreign countries Montenegro has greatly strengthened her position. She has now her own arsenal and cartridge factory, and her officers are trained in foreign academies. It is interesting to know that the officers who were trained at the Bulgarian Military School at Sofia are considered second to none in general proficiency. The fact that France, Italy, Russia, and Servia have at different times by gifts of money or weapons contributed to the development of the army need cause no shame to the Montenegrin. This help was but a return for services and sacrifices in the past. Venice in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and through her Italy at large, undoubtedly owed her safety not a little to the bulwark formed by Montenegro against the Turkish advance, and she had always requited her ally with characteristic ingratitude. Peter the Great was the first of many Czars who did not scorn to ask the help of the little State to deliver Christendom from the Turks; and from the time of Kossovo onwards Montenegro has always been an asylum for all the Serbs who fled to her from their Turkish conquerors, and a rising in the Herzegovina or in Servia has rarely failed to create a sympathetic movement on the part of the Montenegrins. It is less easy to understand the acceptance of an equipment for a squadron of cavalry from the Sultan, for the Turks certainly owed no debt of gratitude to the neighbours who had always been a thorn in the flesh to them.

The girdle of forts which faces Montenegro all along her Austrian frontier has recently moved her to imitate on a small scale the example of these menacing preparations. Austro-Hungary, like other Continental Powers, is haunted by dread of spies and fear of the camera, and the Montenegrin Government, not to be behind her neighbours, issued orders lately forbidding strangers, rightly enough, to photograph fortifications. Two French priests were surprised, not long ago, to find themselves arrested on the charge of having photographed some gendarmes in a country town, where there was no trace of a fortification. They had not realised that it is men and not masonry that make the fortresses of Montenegro.

A year ago the Prince startled his subjects by presenting them with a Constitution. The motives that prompted this unsought gift were possibly various. The heir-apparent, Prince Danilo, would probably be more acceptable to the people as a constitutional than an autocratic ruler; the Prince may have wished to lighten his own burdens, and responsible ministers are a convenient institution to refer to when the representatives of foreign Powers urge conflicting courses on a perplexed sovereign.

Moreover, Servia, Bulgaria, and now Russia herself, each Slavonic State, had her Constitution; Montenegro, the forerunner, the standard-

bearer of Slavonic freedom, must not lag behind. The great Servian idea—the union, that is, of all Servian peoples—lurks at the back of the mind of all good Serbs, and he would be a poor Servian Prince indeed who did not remember that the Empire of the Servian Czar Dushan once stretched from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, and from the Adriatic almost to Adrianople. It is true that the Empire did not retain its widest extent for more than a decade, and that Bulgarian Czars had earlier ruled over almost the same territory. Historical claims to empire are mutually destructive, and if admitted would work strange havoc with the map of Europe. But the great Servian idea is a factor which must be reckoned with in Balkan politics, for the Slavs are an imaginative race, and Czar Dushan and his empire are real entities to every little Servian goatherd in these lands. Montenegro has, at least, an equal claim with Danubian Servia to the most glorious traditions of the Serbs; she was occupied by Servian settlers at the same time as Servia herself; she formed part of the great Servian Confederation of the seventh century, and from the twelfth century, of the Servian Empire, and when that Empire fell at Kossovo, she became a refuge for the aristocracy of Danubian Servia, who could not endure the Turkish yoke. A certain rivalry has always existed between the rulers of Servia and Montenegro as representatives of the great Servian idea, especially as regards the Servians under alien rule in Bosnia, the Herzegovina, and Old Servia; but it was Prince Nicholas's uncle and predecessor, Danilo the Second, who, with characteristic Montenegrin chivalry, said to Milosh of Servia: 'Prince, go forward, and I also will go forward. Whenever our ways meet, trust me to be the first to hail you as Czar of the Serbs.'

How far the Montenegrins appreciated the gift of a Constitution it is difficult to say. The Slav peasant is inclined at first to resent being asked to think for himself—I except the Bulgarian, who is ready and able enough to do so—even to the extent of choosing representatives to think for him. 'Think thou for us, and we will act on thy words,' expresses his attitude to a ruler he believes in; if he is consulted, he becomes suspicious and critical; it must be that his ruler does not himself know what to do. The Montenegrin, who has great natural intelligence, is, nevertheless, quite willing to acquiesce in the Gospodar's decisions, but why should his neighbour, who is no wiser than himself, have a voice in the government of the country? At first it seemed that matters would not be greatly changed from the times when the Vladika, having called together the heads of the clans to consult them as to making terms with the enemy, prefaced their deliberations with the warning: 'Him that advises compliance I shall instantly excommunicate.' Under the new Constitution the members of the Supreme Council are appointed by the Prince, and in the Skupschtina, though there are sixty-six elected deputies, the high church dignitaries, and generals

and ministers of State, who have seats in it, seemed likely to influence the proceedings of the assembly not a little, but the Skupschtina of this winter has proved restive, and its attacks on the Government have actually resulted in a change of ministers. If the Skupschtina can devise a way to lighten taxation, which is now terribly heavy on the peasant, it will not have existed in vain.

But in spite of the Constitution and the Skupschtina, it will be long before the peasant can realise that the Government does not begin and end with the Gospodar. And small wonder, for the Gospodars for fifty years have borne the burden and the heat of the day for him ; it was the Gospodar whose victories doubled the territory of the Black Mountain, and it is he, with his distinguished minister, the Voivod Bozo Petrovitch, who has steered the ship through these thirty years of peace, the first Montenegro has ever known. 'Que voulez-vous ?' said the Prince to me, speaking of the material progress of his country. 'Pendant cinq siècles nous avons fait la guerre ; we have had no time to think of other things ; it is only now that we have begun to build schools and to make roads.' Next to the Emperor of Austria, Prince Nicholas has reigned longer than any sovereign in Europe. His fine face, with its dark poet's eyes, shows something of the stress of his life, but there is vigour and power and intelligence in every line of it. There is no more imposing figure or interesting personality in all the Balkans than Prince Nicholas, who is at once a statesman, a general, and a poet.

Nothing can be more characteristic than the approach to Montenegro up the windings of the beautiful Bocche di Cattaro from the Adriatic. The great bare mountain, which rises sheer above the little town of Cattaro, seems to bar the way to all comers, and after nearly four hours' ascent by long zigzags the traveller finds himself still apparently a stone's throw above the houses, which lie nearly 4,000 feet beneath him. A humble sign-post marks the boundary between Austrian territory and Montenegro, and the road leads on through a characteristic landscape ; bare walls of precipice bound each horizon, and on every side are stones in sheets, in piles, in ridges, in cataracts, that seem to offer endless defiance to the peasant who would wring his living out of them.

Niegush, a village lying high in a circle of bare hills, is about half-way on the eight or ten hours' drive between Cattaro and Cettinje. It is distinguished for the least exacting of custom-houses and as the cradle of the Petrovitch family, which for more than two hundred years has given Montenegro her rulers, all of whom have been men of mark. For the rest Niegush is, like all Karst villages, barely distinguishable from the surrounding stones ; when the Montenegrin builds himself a habitation, it is, with its thick walls, stone roof, and small loopholes of windows, more like a blockhouse than an ordinary dwelling-place, and there is, of course, no soil to spare for the cultiva-

tion of flowers. But a traveller takes his impressions largely from personal considerations, and it was at Niegush that I made my first Montenegrin friend. In Montenegro one does not wait for introductions; it is enough that you are a stranger, and every Montenegrin feels himself your host. The Kapitan of Niegush, tall, fair, blue-eyed and beautiful in his national dress, is well placed at the outposts of the principality, for the stranger, to whom the Kapitan points out with patriotic pride the charms of Niegush, its pure air and water, its schools and churches, and the great height of Lorchen towering above it, will begin to feel at once the strange fascination which every scene in the Black Mountain exercises.

Cettinje, the capital, lies among encircling white mountains in a high narrow plateau that is bitterly cold in winter. The town itself —it numbers 4,000 inhabitants—consists of little more than a single street, chiefly of one-storeyed houses. The royal palaces, some of the legations, and the hotel are almost the only buildings that recall the mansions of a European capital. The relative size of the legations suggests the degree of influence exercised by different Powers in Montenegro. Russia has always been her special protector, and Austria, her powerful neighbour, has always loomed large in Montenegrin politics, as the palaces of their respective Ministers proclaim; but it is significant of the present change in the aspect of things that the Italian legation, which is now rising from its foundations, will dominate not only the rival embassies but the whole town of Cettinje. The railway—the first Montenegro has ever seen—which before two years are over will connect the port of Antivari with Vir Bazar on the Lake of Scutari, the steamers that will ply between Vir Bazar and Scutari, the development of the harbour at Antivari, and the tobacco monopoly are all Italian enterprises. Scutari is at present the end of all things as far as travel and commerce are concerned, but she may in the future prove a *point de départ* for Albania in more senses than one. Italy has more wares to put on the Albanian market than Montenegro, and an Austrian advance to Mitrovitza or beyond might be the excuse or the signal for an Italian 'penetration' into the mysterious fastnesses of Albania. Montenegro is too small and too poor a State to stand alone, and Italy, whose queen was a Montenegrin princess, is thus bound to her by family ties, as well as by those of political sympathy. If the policy of Montenegro must be directed from without, it is surely well that this direction should come from the State, under whose sympathetic influence South Slavonic art and culture attained at Ragusa their highest expression.

The most notable buildings in Cettinje are, of course, the monastery where the Vladikas are buried, and the tower, which was once kept garnished with trophies of Turks' heads; but the single street, wide and spotlessly clean, is a perpetual joy to the traveller, for the picturesque population of Cettinje seems to have unlimited time to

wander up and down it. Nothing can be more becoming than the dress of the men ; a long white or pale-green coat—the cloth, alas ! is made in Vienna—hanging very full below a coloured sash, the receptacle of the weapons without which no Montenegrin would feel able to face the world, a red waistcoat with heavy gold embroidery, full blue knickerbockers, high-top boots, or white gaiters, and a red cap, on which the Prince's initials are worked. The women, who have not time to put on their best dresses as often as the men, wear a long sleeveless coat, generally of pale apple-green, over a chemise, round the neck and down the front of which runs a narrow band of coloured embroidery : the patterns, which have been handed down for generations, are often charming. There is sometimes gold embroidery at the corners of the coat, and sometimes a velvet waistcoat is worn under it. The skirt has a tendency to become European in form. The hair is braided and worn round the head in a simple coronal, which is infinitely becoming to the straight classical features of a beautiful Serb. Not the least interest of the Cettinje street is that the Prince may often be seen there, driving himself in a low pony carriage, a couple of peasants, perhaps, walking by his side, eager to tell the Gospodar some trouble or to get his advice ; or the Princess, a beautiful old lady, with the profile of a fine cameo, the highest type of her beautiful race. And where else but in Cettinje would you see the Prime Minister sitting before the door of the Foreign Office in the cool of the evening, or the Minister of War, fully armed and ready apparently at any moment to direct the movements of troops in person ?

I chanced to be in Cettinje on the name-day of the saint who presided at the conversion of the Princesse Héritière, and I think it would be difficult to find a handsomer collection of men than the procession of notables—stately voivods and ministers, kapitans and dashing officers—who went from the church to the palace to congratulate the Princess. The Montenegrin walks as though he had only just come back from a victorious engagement with the Turks, and the swing of light green coats and glitter of embroideries produce a brilliant effect. ' In Montenegro everyone is a gentleman,' a peasant woman in the Herzegovina once said to me : she herself was a ragged princess with bare feet and an acre of stony hillside to call her own, but with the grand air and the beauty that so often distinguish these mountain races.

The heights which encircle Cettinje drop towards the south by steep gorges to the plain of Scutari, and so form the bastions of the citadel of the true Black Mountain. The road to Podgoritza passes the village of Rieka, picturesquely overhanging the river, down which a little steamer makes its way through beds of water-lilies to the lake. Above Rieka once stood the fortress of Obod, near which Ivan the Black is supposed, like Frederick Barbarossa, to lie asleep till his people's need awakes him. It was at Obod, too, that, only seven

years after Caxton had printed his first book, the Servian ruler of the Zeta, as this district was called, put up his printing press, which he afterwards carried with him into the mountains, when the Turks drove him out of the plains.

Podgoritza is a straggling town, inhabited chiefly by Albanians and Turks, who camp rather than settle, and seldom think it worth while to repair the dilapidations time makes in their dwellings. A mile or two behind Podgoritza, under the hills, is the site of the ancient city of Dioclea, the reputed birthplace of the Emperor Diocletian, the early capital of the Zeta and the cradle of the Nemanja family, Servia's greatest czars. I reached Dioclea about sunset, the only bearable hour of a breathless August day. The bare mountains of Kolashin and Albania and the dim plain towards the lake were softened into dreamy outlines, and the splendid sky suddenly brought colour and richness into the landscape of monotonous whites and greys. By the single span-bridge over the river, near which Dioclea was built, there is an old Turkish fortress, a brown massive almost windowless place, with rounded walls. Beyond the river, the vague fields are strewn with fallen columns, carved stones, and outlines of many foundations. A low flight of broad marble steps and a long paved walk lead up to what was once the palace entrance; the walls are still standing up to the level of the window-sills, but within ivy and tangled undergrowth have taken possession. All was entirely silent, entirely deserted. It was from Dioclea that St. Sava—that gentle mystical figure, peacemaker in family feuds and national quarrels, founder of the Servian Church—set out on his pious journey to the East seven hundred years ago, to bring back holy relics for the churches he had built in his native land.

When I left Dioclea the moon had risen and the river lay like a yellow streak beneath the black arch of the bridge; the memories and influences of the distant past seemed to cling undisturbed about the ruined city in the peaceful fields under the mountains of this wild borderland.

The road from Podgoritza to Nikshitch follows the valley of the Zeta, which here and there widens into a fertile plain, some six miles across. It passes the towns of Spuj and Danilograd, the latter a bazar centre of some importance, and climbs the long mountain side that faces the Monastery of Ostrog, the Lourdes of the Eastern Church, to which pilgrims of many faiths and many lands come for relief of their ills. The upper monastery consists of a series of caves in the side of precipitous cliffs, approached by steps in the rock. This upper monastery has been the scene of Homeric conflicts, such as abound in Montenegrin history. It was here, in 1862, that Prince Mirko, father of the present Prince, and one of the finest of his race, with a handful of companions, for nineteen days defied a whole Turkish army, finally effecting a safe retreat through the midst of them; and a hundred

years before thirty Montenegrins held the caves successfully for months against 30,000 Turks, their marksmen picking off all who ventured near. Ten times has the lower monastery been burnt, but only once for a short time did the Turks occupy the upper monastery.

I chanced to make my pilgrimage to the tomb of Saint Vasil, when the body of the saint had just been uncovered for the devout kisses of a peasant family, who had brought a white-faced baby for his aid. Below in the guest room I saw a sick Albanian Bey, a Mussulman, who was staying here a second time in the hope of a cure at the hands of the saint. My driver, a boy belonging to the wild gipsy race, which in the East is alternately Christian and Mohammedan, although it is received and recognised by neither confession, told me that his brother had been brought to Ostrog bound with ropes, a raving lunatic, and had left it a few hours later cured and sane. At the monastery entrance we passed a woman spinning by the roadside. To my surprise my driver overwhelmed her with a torrent of bad language. 'Don't you know,' he said to me in explanation, 'that it is very bad luck to pass or meet anyone working by the roadside? Everyone knows they have no right to sit and work there. But now I have cursed her well,' as he certainly had, 'and it won't do you any harm.' I had already had painful experience of the truth of another Balkan superstition—namely, that it is unlucky to meet a pope on the road, though popes of course must sometimes travel. A meeting with a pope in the morning had undoubtedly coincided with an arrest on two occasions, once with a carriage accident and another time with a waterspout.

Nikshitch, the second town in Montenegro, was taken from the Turks by Prince Nicholas, after four months' siege, in his victorious campaign of 1876, and the Powers, with unwonted generosity towards the State they had so often made use of and then neglected, allowed Montenegro to retain the strip of fertile country her arms had won. Will they ever give back to her the coast line which Nature destined for her, and of which the selfishness of a Great Power has deprived her?

Nikshitch, where the Prince has built a new palace and a simple stately church overlooking the plain, would in many ways be a better site for a capital than Cettinje; a railway along the valley of the Zeta, which would follow the example of that strange, half-underground river, and tunnel through the mountains that divide the plateau of Nikshitch from the valley of Bielopavlitch, might some day connect it with Vir Bazar and the sea. But the historical claims of Cettinje are too powerful to be overlooked, and the Great Powers, which have invested large sums of money in building their legations at Cettinje, are not likely to consent to a change of capital.

From Nikshitch I rode to the frontier through the long windings of the Duga Pass, the Thermopylæ of Montenegro, through which the Turks so many times advanced to attack the Black Mountain, and

through which the Prince led his people on the celebrated march across the Herzegovina. One of the guides, whom the Prince in his kindness had sent with me, a blue-eyed stalwart of the old best type, Krsto by name, had been with the army and remembered many details of the fighting. 'But you must have been very young then?' I said. 'Oh no, not very young, I was thirteen or fourteen, and there were many boys with us much younger. We took hundreds of Turkish prisoners,' he went on, 'and they all expected that we should cut off their heads, but the Gospodar is very merciful, and he would not let us do it, but he gave the Turks money, and sent them away to their own country. And where there was most fighting, there the Gospodar would go, and his tent was in the midst of us.'

Midway in the pass was Krsto's home, and there in a little booth, which his sons had raised and covered with ferns, we feasted on sour milk and coffee and honey. It was a twelve hours' ride to the frontier, and darkness came on before we reached it. The single room of the khan where we halted did not attract me, and I told my servant to arrange my travelling bed somewhere in the open. An hour later, after a vague meal, when I found my way in the darkness across the hillside to the white patch formed by my mosquito net, which my servant regarded as the nearest equivalent to a tent, I noticed that the immediate surroundings were unusually stony, even for Montenegro. 'This place seems very like a cemetery,' I said doubtfully to the old guardsman. 'Well, yes, it *is* a cemetery,' he admitted apologetically, 'but we put you here because we thought you would be less disturbed. You see, none of the villagers will come here because of the ghosts.' 'But what am I to do with the ghosts?' I asked, with some concern. 'Oh,' he said, 'they are only the ghosts of the Turks we killed here forty years ago, and really I think they must have all gone away by this time.' The place was Krstatz, where seven hundred men, it is said, fell in 1876, five Turks for every Montenegrin. But the poor ghosts were still and silent that night, though a thunderstorm played over the hills, and a bitter wind took possession of the pass and blew my mosquito net far away among the tombstones.

The lonely hut of a border kapitan, on a little hill of its own midway across the pass, marks the boundary here between Montenegro and the Herzegovina, and from this point the Prince's guards turned back; their crimson uniforms, as they rode away up the stony track, made the only touch of colour in the sombre scene.

The future of Montenegro must be a matter of some concern to those who feel admiration for her past and sympathy with her present. She has always inspired an interest out of all proportion to her size and importance, and the sentiment of Europe—if such a thing exists—would surely be against any idea of her partition or absorption by other Powers. It is rather in her internal condition that the danger lies. The Montenegrin lost his occupation when he ceased to fight

the Turk, and it is a dangerous thing to take away the *raison d'être* of a man's life and to give him nothing in return. But Montenegro has not the capital to start commercial enterprises or even to develop her harbours, and her past has hardly been a training in the arts of peace. It is not fair to blame the Montenegrin Government if these thirty years of peace have been marked by no more startling progress. To expect great developments is to ask figs of thistles or, literally, that stones may be made bread. The lightening of taxation and the spread of agricultural science would do much to stem the tide of emigration and to improve the general condition of the country, and, above all, the Montenegrin will have to learn that he cannot rest only on the laurels of the past, and that there is a dignity in labour and no shame. It is well if the national character, with its passionate love of freedom, its devotion to the bare rocks of the Black Mountain and its fine simplicity, has not deteriorated in these years of inaction. Let us at least remember that Montenegro, by the example of her matchless courage, has done more for Europe than Europe has done or can ever do for Montenegro.

ELLINOR F. B. THOMPSON.

ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF MERCENARIES IN ANCIENT AND MODERN TIMES

In the following pages I shall attempt to elucidate two theses:

(1) That in all our wars, from Crecy to Waterloo, we have received most material assistance from foreign mercenaries.

(2) That this resource is cut off from us for all future time; that we can never again employ foreign troops from outside our own dominions in any future wars.

The difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of serviceable recruits in the present day, and the persistent refusal of all classes of Englishmen to prepare themselves for the defence of their country, make our subject a very interesting, though painful one, and throws a lurid light on the apathy and lack of patriotism of the English people. It seems useless to point out to them the inevitable result of their selfish and ignoble conduct, for they act with their eyes open. They see that the condition of affairs in Europe has entirely changed; that our rivals and possible foes have added tenfold to their military strength since the last great wars, while we have remained stationary; and that we are relatively far weaker than at any period of our history.

Without dwelling further on these facts, I proceed to show in a brief sketch the important part played by mercenaries in past ages, and especially in France and England.

We need hardly refer to the trite examples from ancient history: to the 10,000 Greeks who fought under Cyrus against his brother Artaxerxes; or to the Lacedæmonian troops under their King Agesilaus the Second, whom Tachos hired for his war against the Persians; or to the victories of Xantippus, the Lacedæmonian in the service of Carthage, over the Romans under the noble but unfortunate Regulus. Nor need we remind the reader of the example of Carthage or Venice, whose empire was sustained by mercenaries alone, unless it be to show that in ancient as well as modern times the employment of mercenaries was not considered dishonourable.

Of modern nations France, perhaps, has been the most beholden to the aid of foreigners, not only in the rank and file of her army, but in the higher and highest grades of officers.

As early as the year 886 A.D., Charles le Gros formed a guard of twenty-four Scotch gentlemen for the protection of his person against the machinations of his own subjects. His example was followed by St. Louis in 1226 A.D., who, when starting for the Holy Land, took twenty-four Scotch noblemen into his service, 'qui eussent la garde de son corps, jour et nuit.'

During the whole of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Europe was overrun by hordes of armed brigands, who played a very prominent part in the long wars between England and France, and not infrequently formed the great bulk of the opposing armies.

Bertrand du Guesclin, cited by Du Cange, draws a fearful picture of the persons and manners of these formidable vagabonds—the offscourings of every nation, whom Louis the Seventh of France employed against Henry the Second of England towards the middle of the twelfth century A.D. :

> Gens de maint pays, et de mainte nation,
> L'un Anglais, l'autre Escot, si avait maint Breton ;
> Hannuyers et Normants, y avait à foison,
> Par le pays prendre leur mansion,
> Et prenoient partout les gens à raingons,
> Et il demeuroit bœuf, vache ne mouton,
> Ne pain, ne char, ne vin, ne oye, ne chapon,
> Tant pillar, meurtrier, traiteur et felon,
> Etaient dans la route, dont je fais mention.

These bands were employed in great numbers by Philip Augustus of France, and by John and Henry the Third of England ; and throughout the long contest for the possession of France they fought on both sides, and were always ready to desert to the highest bidder.

It may, therefore, be easily imagined that they sometimes proved very dangerous and precarious subjects, especially at the end of a war. Philip Augustus was several times obliged to turn his arms against them, and on one occasion he destroyed 17,000 of them, and on another 12,000, as the only means of saving the country from pillage and devastation. Yet the same description of force appears again and again in the armies of England and France during the whole of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. At Crecy (1346) Philip the Sixth had 15,000 Ligurian mountaineers—the so-called 'Genoese archers'—in his great army. At Poitiers, Jean le Bon led the same brigands against the Prince of Wales ; and at Agincourt, German cavalry, under the Comtes de Saarbrück, de Nassau, and de Nidau, fought in the French ranks.

After the Peace of Bretigny (1360) the Earl of Warwick, in France, dismissed the mercenaries who had fought on the English side. They immediately took service, under leaders of their own selection, under the name of 'La grande Compagnie,' and began fighting and plundering on their own account. John King of France, terrified by their audacity,

sent an army against them under the Constable Jacques de Bourbon. But the brigands stoutly resisted, and, in a great battle fought near Lyons, Bourbon and his son were fatally wounded, and died soon afterwards at Brignais in 1362 A.D.

One of these formidable hordes under Jean de Gourges, who called himself 'L'ami de Dieu et l'ennemi de tout le monde,' made a threatening advance on Avignon, then the residence of Urban the Fifth. The Pope, in an agony of terror, excommunicated them and preached a crusade against de Gourges and his followers. But as he had no money to offer his troops, but only indulgences, they joined the brigands, and Urban appealed for protection to the Marquis de Montferrat, who persuaded some of de Gourges' troops to withdraw into Italy; and Bertrand du Guesclin proposed to lead the remainder into Spain, at that time harassed by Peter the Cruel.

At the earnest request of these pious scoundrels, du Guesclin first led them to Avignon, where the Pope sent one of his cardinals to meet them, arrayed in his richest robes, which they proposed to strip off his back. Urban then gave them the coveted absolution with one hand and money with the other, on condition of their leaving his dominions *le jour même*. They withdrew, and then pursued a victorious career in Spain until the Prince of Wales defeated them and took du Guesclin prisoner.

At the end of the fifteenth century a new force, under the name of Lansquenets, began to play a prominent part in the religious wars of the Reformation. Knighthood, the main support of the feudal system, was slowly dying. The Emperor Maximilian, deserted by his nobles and the subjects of his consort, Maria of Burgundy, and too poor to pay the Swiss, began to form an army, chiefly of infantry, from his hereditary dominions of Austria, Swabia, and the Tyrol. These men, under the name of Landsknechte, raised in the earlier and better period, were drawn from the class of respectable peasants and artisans, and were animated by loyalty and patriotism. But they were soon demoralised by the licence of a long life in camps, and gradually degenerated into a landless, venal *soldateska* ready to fight on any side for any cause which promised them rich pay and plunder.

Brantome reports that at the siege of Pampeluna, when the Earl of Suffolk commanded them to advance to the attack of a castle, 4,000 of them replied, 'qu'ils n'iroient point, qu'ils n'eussent pas double paye.' The Lansquenets not infrequently deserted at the commencement of an action and changed camps with the enemy. At the siege of Flemanges they sold their general for a small sum, and surrendered the castle to the Count of Nassau. But if these motley hordes often proved mutinous and treacherous, it was often the fault of their constantly changing leaders, who were either unable or unwilling to pay them their dues, and cheated them by base coinage and in other ways. Knowing and caring nothing about the cause

for which they were fighting, they not unnaturally retorted by threats of desertion, declaring, 'Der Landsknecht muss essen und trinken, bezahle es der Pfaffe oder der Küster.'

The most remarkable figure among the leaders of the Lansquenets in the earlier period of their existence was Georg von Freundsberg, the friend of Luther. He was the first to form them by education and discipline into a trustworthy and formidable force. It was he who supported Maximilian the First against the Swiss in the pay of France, and saved the army of Charles the Fifth at Valenciennes, and in 1522 joined the Emperor in his invasion of Italy with 6,000 Lansquenets. But even he could not prevent their rapid deterioration. They mutinied for higher pay in 1527, and he died in the following year of fatigue and despair.

The Lansquenets were required to bring with them spear, sword, and helmet, but might wear whatever costume they pleased. Before a battle they knelt in prayer, and then, according to primæval custom, threw dust behind them.

The description given by Brantôme applies to these troops in their degeneracy, and to the predatory hordes of an earlier time, described above:

> Ils étoient [he says] tels que vous les trouverez dans les vieux romans de Louis XII. et François I., et peints et représentés dans les vieilles peintures et vitres d'anciennes maisons, Dieu sait comment habillés! plus *à la pendarde* vraiment, comme on disoit, de ce temps, qu'à la propriété; portants des chemises longues, et larges manches comme Bohèmes de jadis et Mores, qui leur duroient vetus plus de deux ou trois mois sans changer, montrant leur poitrines velues et pelues, toutes découvertes, les chausses les plus bigarrées, dechiquetées et balafrées, et la plupart montroient la chair des cuisses, voire les fesses; mais il falloit que la plupart montrassent la jambe nue. Sur quoi [dit Brantôme] il me sovient qu'un combat à la barrière se faisant un jour à cour en la salle basse du Louvre; entre autres combattants paroit le Capitaine Bruno, gentil cavalier, certes, mais bien bizarre en tout: il étoit en point, et bien habillé, mais il avoit une jambe chaussée, et l'autre nue.

But bad as they were, they seem to have been very serviceable to the French monarchs, who found them more trustworthy than their own subjects. 'Some of them,' says Brantôme, 'were valuable in every way, especially while under the influence of such men as Georg von Freudenberg. Mais la plupart, gens de sac et de corde, méchants garniments, échappez de la justice et surtout marquez de la fleur de lys sur l'épaule, esorillez et qui cachoient les oreilles, à dire vrai, par longs cheveux herissez, barbes horribles.'

Although for the most part firm believers in the efficacy of religious rites and ceremonies, and careful to get absolution for their crimes, either by threats or actual violence, they seemed to take a pride in their evil renown, and boasted 'Un Lansquenet ne peut pas aller en Enfer, parceque qu'il troublerait le repos du Diable.'

Another description of force which played a great part in the

war between Spain and the Netherlands were the Reitres (Reiter)—German cavalry. Of them Brantôme says, 'ils etaient diables noirs, who blackened their faces to terrify the enemy.' They were mostly emancipated serfs—Saxons, Brunswickers, Allemands de Deux-Ponts, who were readily sold by the minor German potentates to the highest bidder, and often served in opposing armies.

About the same time as the Lansquenets—in the latter half of the fifteen century—the Swiss began their long career of military service in the pay of France, fighting sometimes by the side of the Lansquenets, and sometimes against them.

In the year 1444 Charles the Seventh of France was called on by the Emperor Frederick the Fourth, surnamed the Pacific, to help in putting down 'those dangerous Republicans the Swiss,' and thereby support the cause of monarchy in Europe. Charles, possessed by the inveterate longing of the French to extend the borders of their country, especially on the Rhine, readily assented.

The French army, divided into two corps, one of which was led by Charles himself, the other by the Dauphin, marched upon the territory of Basle. The army was about 30,000 strong, and consisted for the most part of the so-called 'Companies,' under the name of 'Armagnacs,' but there were also 8,000 Anglo-Normans in the ranks.

The citizens of Basle, terrified by the overwhelming force which threatened them, applied for protection to the Swiss Confederacy, which immediately sent a *corps d'élite* to their aid. A terrible battle ensued on the River Birs, near Basle. The two divisions of the Swiss, amounting together to only 16,000 men, after an heroic resistance, and refusing all terms of surrender, were cut down to a man, and the victorious French lost 10,000 men. The experienced leader of the latter declared that all the previous combats in which he had been engaged 'were mere child's play compared with this encounter of giants.'

The heroism of the Swiss on this occasion roused the highest admiration and deepest sympathy of the French, which they did not care to conceal from the German nobles with whom they were allied. Nor were they at all anxious to extend the dominion and the power of the Emperor Frederick. King Charles and the Dauphin clearly saw the immense advantage to be gained by the service of such valiant and trustworthy warriors as the Swiss, and instead of pursuing their advantage against them, the King made a treaty 'de bonne intelligence et ferme amitié' with the nobles, bourgeois et paysans de Berne, Basle, Lucerne, Soleure, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Claris; et avec le Duc de Savoie, les Comtes de Neufchatel, alliés et confédérés des Ligues de la haute Allemagne,' as Switzerland was at that time called. The Swiss also entered into a secret understanding with Charles to furnish him with 4,000 men when he required their aid.

After the memorable encounter of St. Jacob on the River Birs,

the Swiss played a prominent part in every French war. And these sturdy Republicans, who were ready to lay down their lives for their own liberties, were equally ready to shed their blood (for sufficient pay !) in support of despotism, whether of Kings or Popes.

Their services were soon called into requisition. In the successive invasions of Italy by Charles the Eighth, the Swiss formed the bravest and most trustworthy division of the invading army, and in 1494 Charles crossed the Alps with no less than 8,000 Swiss ! In his pompous entry into Rome by the Porta del Popolo, the heavy-armed Swiss formed the *avant-garde*—the place of honour. They were immediately followed by the German Lansquenets, and then came the light French infantry, crossbowmen and other archers.

Francis the First, in his contest with the German Empire, employed both Swiss and Lansquenets ; but he was well aware of the superiority of the former. In an Ordonnance of 1543 he bitterly deplores the necessity of employing the Lansquenets—' hommes méchants, flagitieux, abandonnés à tous les vices ' ; while he frequently exalts the courage and loyalty of the Swiss. After the battle of Pavia in 1525, in which he ' lost everything but honour,' we are told that ' voyant la place où il avait combattu toute jonchée de leurs cadavres, il s'écriait avec un douloureux sentiment de reconnaissance : " Si tous mes soldats avaient fait leur devoir comme ces étrangers, le sort de cette journée eut été différent." '

In all the great actions of the French army, foreigners played a prominent and often decisive part. Louis the Fifteenth employed men of every nation in Europe, and also men from Guinea, Congo, Cayenne, Senegal, San Domingo, Arabia, and Pondicherry. At the battle of Fontenoy (the 30th of April, N.S. the 11th of May), of which France is so proud as one of her few victories over England, the Swiss Guards and the German (Würtemberg) cavalry formed the chief strength of the French army, and the Irish Brigade, under Lally, decided the day.

In the reign of Henry the Second of France the Swiss were charged exclusively with the maintenance of the military honour of France in Piedmont. And in the famous Retreat of Meaux they made a rampart of their bodies for Charles the Ninth, which the Protestant cavalry tried in vain to break through ; and at Arques, at Jarnac, Moncontour, and Ivry, they bore away the palm, both in victory and retreat.

The confidence of the French monarch in the devotion and loyalty of the Swiss was so great that they, and sometimes the Scotch, were entrusted with the defence of the royal person : ' Après Dieu,' said Charles the Ninth, after his escape from prison, ' c'est aux Suisses et au Duc de Nemours que je dois mon royaume.'

In 1585 Henry the Third signed the following Ordonnance : ' Le Roi veut qu'il y ait douze Suisses, jour et nuit, près et autour sa Majesté,'

and we know that this arrangement lasted to the very latest times of the French monarchy.

After the assassination of Henry the Fourth the Swiss renewed their allegiance to Marie de Médicis, who also employed foreigners from every land—German, Irish, Scotch, Liégeois, Italians, Suédois, Hungarians, and Croats.

Louis the Fourteenth employed Swiss soldiers in still greater numbers than his predecessors. It is related that in 1685 the Grand Monarque's Ministers taunted Pierre Stupa, the famous Swiss colonel, with the enormous sums of money which his countrymen had received from the French. 'With the gold,' said the French Minister, 'you have received from us, a road might be paved from Paris to Basle.' 'That is true,' replied Stupa; 'and with the blood which the Swiss have shed in the service of France, you could fill a canal from Basle to Paris.'

The Swiss were the last and most faithful defenders of the French monarchy. In 1789 their regiments, under Salis-Samade, and some German cavalry encamped in the École Militaire and the Champs Élysées. We all know what befell them there.

Nor did the services of the Swiss to France end with the monarchy. The French Republic offered to retain their services, and the Swiss regiments accepted the terms, with the exception of the Regiment d'Ernest.

In August 1792 the National Assembly invited other foreigners to enlist, and enrolled a considerable number of Belgians, Dutch, and Germans. Anacharsis Cloots, the German baron, was probably the author of the following appeal to his countrymen:

> O Brüder, deutsches Blut, Ihr noch bethörten Krieger,
> Sagt eurer Knechtschaft ab, seid ferner Freiheit's Sieger.
> Erkämpft euch dieses Recht, das man in Frankreich lehrt,
> Sterbt frei, lehrt, sucht, und macht
> Dass euch die Nachwelt ehrt.

Perhaps the most heterogeneous *colluvies gentium* was to be found in the army of Kléber, under whom fought Sardinians, Corsicans, Savoyards, Italians, Maltese, Turks, Greeks, Copts, Syrians, Armenians, Circassians, Ethiopians, Georgians, and Negroes.

The extent to which France was indebted to foreigners under the Republic and the Empire, not merely in the rank and file but in the very highest ranks of her army, is best measured by the official list of foreign marshals and generals: 33 Poles and Russians; 24 Sardinians; 20 Germans; 18 Dutch; 15 Swiss; 10 British (chiefly Irish); 10 Belgians; 5 Portuguese; 4 Spanish; 4 from the States of the Church; 2 Egyptians; 1 Dane; 1 Ionian.

At the Restoration most of the foreign troops were dismissed, but a new capitulation was entered into with the Swiss to form a Légion d'Étrangers for service out of France, and four Swiss

legions were given to the Comte d'Artois, brother of King Louis the Eighteenth, and these fought and suffered in defence of Charles the Tenth.

Mercenaries in the Service of England

Although not nearly to the same extent as France, England, too, has been deeply indebted to mercenaries in all the great wars which she has waged for the maintenance of her liberties or the extension of her Empire. But their services are but little dwelt upon by national historians, and their readers are seldom informed of the great part which foreigners have played in their country's victories.

We have seen in the foregoing pages how largely our victorious monarchs in France employed the services of the 'great companies' of mercenary brigands and the German Lansquenets in the fourteenth century. But we do not propose to speak any farther of these earlier times, but rather of the latter part of the seventeenth century, when our Sovereigns and statesmen began to hire German, and especially Hessian, troops. We do, indeed, hear of the Hessians as early as the reign of Elizabeth. In 1587 she entered into correspondence with the Landgrave Wilhelm of Hesse-Cassel, to raise troops in his dominions. He was prevented from doing so by the *Reichsverbot*, but he allowed her troops to pass through his territory in 1586, and on all occasions expressed his great respect for the mighty English Queen. She became godmother to one of his daughters, and in his letter of thanks for this honour he says: 'If all the princes who have thrown off the papal yoke were of your mind, so many Evangelical Christians in many lands would not now be so cruelly treated for rejecting idolatry.'

The declining power of the German Emperors, consequent on the ruin of Central Europe in the Thirty Years' War, was eminently favourable to the ambition of the minor German potentates. These had now virtually no master to control them, nor were their subjects, as in larger States, able to check their despotism by the curb of popular opinion. The object of their highest admiration was Louis the Fourteenth of France, and their ludicrous efforts to imitate his Oriental despotism and the ostentatious grandeur of his Court exposed them to the ridicule of all Europe.

It is reported of one of these duodecimo princes that he had a bodyguard of fifty men who wore high heels and had two bearskins among them which the sentinels at the Palace assumed in turns! Another regiment had three different uniforms for the same soldiers, as Grenadiers, Cuirassiers and Jäger. Another prince had a squadron of Dragoons, *on foot*, who at reviews were ordered to *neigh* to help the illusion! The traffic in the blood of subjects was begun on a large scale by the Landgrave Carl of Hesse-Cassel. After the year 1676 he transferred a contingent of his troops, which had already been

employed by the German Emperor against France, to Christian V. of Denmark.

A few years later (1687), when Venice was at war with Turkey, he lent 1,000 men to the Republic, and in 1688 he sent 3,400 to the States General of Holland for service against France.

During the war of the Spanish Succession, the same Carl made a regular Convention with the maritime Powers, England and Holland, to supply them with good and serviceable troops, and four years later 10,500 were sent to them for their wars in Italy.

The victorious armies of Marlborough were, as is well known, largely supplemented by foreign mercenaries. At Blenheim (1704), when Rowe had fallen and the English were driven back from the palisades by three French squadrons, it was the Hessian corps which checked the French cavalry and saved the day. At Ramillies it was the Dutch Guards who covered the village of Tairières, the key of Villeroy's position, and with the help of the Danish horse cut up the French and drove them into the River Melargno. After the accession of the House of Brunswick we see German regiments taking part in all our battles down to very recent times, and serving as garrisons in Gibraltar, Minorca and the Crimea. After the Peace of Utrecht, George the First made a new agreement with the Landgrave Carl, who supplied him with 12,000 Hessians for service against the Old Pretender.

Hessians were with the Duke of Cumberland in Scotland in 1745, but are said to have refused to fight because there was no *cartel* for the exchange of prisoners.

Wilhelm the Third of Hesse-Cassel furnished troops to both sides in the war between George the Second of England and the short-lived Emperor Carl the Seventh—6,000 men to each.

But the most remarkable of Hessian Landgraves with whom the dealings of our Sovereigns were the most extensive and the most costly was Frederick the Seventh. This petty monarch, with a territory of 156 square miles, containing 300,000 inhabitants, succeeded in making for himself vast wealth and a great position in Europe by skilful management, and the profitable sale of his stock of human beings. He married Marie, a daughter of George the Second, but when he became a Roman Catholic she refused to live with him, and retired with her children to Hanau.

He was a great admirer of all things French, and rivalled the French kings in the splendour of his Court and the number of his mistresses, by whom he had 100 children.

For these he provided, after the manner of the Persian kings, by raising the tax on salt on the birth of another boy!

One of these boys was General Haynau, who was accused of flogging women, and was hustled and beaten by the draymen of Barclay and Perkins' brewery.

One of these ladies, whom he took over from the Duc de Bouillon, received 2,000 thalers for travelling money and a salary of 40,000 thalers per annum—no mean income in those days of scarce money and cheap living.

In spite of his extravagance, this fortunate Prince left at his death about 60,000,000 thalers, the fruits of his traffic in soldiers and his public lotteries.

He was succeeded in 1785 by his son Wilhelm, who during his father's life ruled independently as Count of Hanau, and carried on the same infamous trade in soldiers. He appears to have been equally selfish, unscrupulous and grasping, but to have been entirely without the literary taste and personal dignity of his sire.

Napoleon drove this Wilhelm from his dominions, saying: 'The House of Cassel has, for many years, sold its subjects to England. In this way the Landgraves have amassed such great treasure. Their vile avarice has now overthrown them.'

The horror of this man of peace at the traffic in blood is highly edifying!

The history of Wilhelm's relation to his mistress, Fräulein von Schlotheim, is a curious one. The poor girl shrank with horror from his first advances, and fled to her parents, *but was sent back by them.* By her Wilhelm had twenty-two children, 'alle ohne Liebe' as the poor victim said! By his other mistresses he had seventy-two children!

As we may easily imagine, the English Ministry did not succeed in raising these troops without vehement opposition in Parliament. From 1641 downwards continual debates took place on this subject, and the utmost watchfulness and jealousy were manifested in both Houses. In 1699 Parliament refused to listen to William the Third's urgent entreaty to be allowed to retain his Dutch Guards. On this the King thought very seriously of abdicating the throne. In 12 and 13 of William the Third, c. 2, it is declared to be necessary that some further provisions be made to secure that 'no one born out of the three kingdoms and the British dominions (even though naturalised) except such as are born of English parents, shall hold any office or place of trust, either civil or military, under the Crown.'

The question of the Royal prerogative to enlist foreigners was fiercely debated in both Houses of Parliament in the years 1730, 1731, 1745, 1756, 1775, 1782, 1784, and on other occasions down to the time of the Crimean war. The Court party held that the King's prerogative empowered him to enlist foreigners for the army without consulting Parliament; the Opposition contended that such an exercise of the Royal power was contrary to the Bill of Rights. Mr. Pitt considered that though such an act on the part of the King was not illegal, the King's Ministers would do well to secure the sanction of Parliament.

As late as 1854 the Duke of Argyll referred to the Act of 1804 in virtue of which the Crown had already enlisted a certain number of foreigners.

In 1731 we see that Mr. Walpole moved for a grant of 230,923*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* for the maintenance of 12,000 Hessians. In the same year a motion was brought forward 'that a humble address be presented to his Majesty,' begging him 'to be graciously pleased, for the ease of his subjects, to give orders for discharging these 12,000 men, the troops of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, now in the pay of his Majesty the King of Great Britain.' This motion, of course, was negatived, but the opposition to the employment of foreigners never relaxed.

The outbreak of the American Rebellion in 1776 found the English Government utterly unprepared for so important a war in such a distant land. The negotiations between the English Ambassador and the Russian Minister, Panin, for a large Russian army, having completely fallen through, recourse was again had to the minor German potentates, and especially to the reigning Landgrave of Hesse, Frederick the Second, who made a treaty with England very much to his own advantage, the terms being much the same as in the previous treaty with Brunswick in 1755.

In these transactions a tariff was fixed for every man killed or wounded, and it was stipulated that these charges, as well as the levy-money and the daily pay, were to be paid, not to the soldier himself or his family, but to the Landgrave's State Minister!

The Landgrave chose to call this transaction a Treaty of Alliance between the King of Great Britain and himself, in which the two Powers mutually guaranteed each others dominions!

In 1775, Sir Joseph Yorke was able to report that besides the Hanoverians troops might be obtained, on moderate terms, from Hesse-Cassel, Hanau, Hesse-Darmstadt, Würtemberg, Saxon Gotha and Baden.

It is true that the Ratisbon Diet had forbidden recruiting by foreign Powers in Germany; but notwithstanding their decree, the English established stations at Frankfort, Neuwied, Cleve, and along the whole course of the Rhine; and the Electors of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves, who were most concerned, made no objection. George the Third is said to have had some scruples at first, but the plea of necessity prevailed, and he consented to a contract to be made with the Hanoverian Lieut.-Colonel Scheither for the enlistment of 4,000 German recruits. This number, as we know, was largely increased during our sad war with America where, in 1776, we had from 12,000 to 13,000 Hessians. The plea on all these occasions on which the English Ministry applied for leave to hire foreign mercenaries was the same one, so disgraceful to a strong, rich nation. 'That the native army was insufficient both in number and quality; the

ranks were filled with immature boys, and that the greater part of the army was utterly unfit to take the field.'

'That, on the other hand, the German States were ready and eager to supply us with well-trained troops, not of boys, but fully developed men, in almost any number; and these were fitted to take the field at once.' It was further urged,

'That they were of approved valour and steady discipline; that they were cheaper than the native army; that when the war was over they could lay no claim to pensions; that in all our wars we had depended on the aid of foreign mercenaries, and that, in fact, we could not do without them.'

The Opposition was, of course, fierce and uncompromising. Lord Chatham (in 1777), who had availed himself on the largest scale of foreign aid, denounced the agreement with the German princes in the loftiest style of his eloquence. 'We have swept,' he said, 'every corner of Germany for men; we have searched the darkest wilds of America for the scalping-knife of the Indian. . . . Peace will never be gained as long as the German bayonet and the Indian tomahawk are threatened to be buried in the bowels of our American brethren.'

In 1776 Lord Irnham takes the same view. 'I shall say nothing of the feelings of those princes who can sell their subjects for such purposes. We have read of Sancho Panza's wish, that, if he were a ruler, all his subjects might be blackamoors, as he could easily sell them and turn them into money. But that wish, however ridiculous, is far more innocent than that of a prince who, availing himself of his despotic power, sells his vassals, sacrifices them in a dishonourable war, and sends them to destroy better men than themselves.'

In 1854 Mr. Sidney Herbert, in support of the Foreign Enlistment Bill, quotes a letter of Napoleon Bonaparte, in which he says, 'Pick me out the older ones; don't send me *boys*, who consume my rations, impede my marches, and encumber my hospitals.' Sidney Herbert also says in the same debate: 'The great mass of our recruits are boys, the lowest age is eighteen, and not only do the great majority not exceed that age, but actually fall short of it; and many even assert themselves to be eighteen when they are considerably younger, while the German recruit is not a boy, but a man, ready to hand.'

Lord John Russell in the same debate pertinently asks the House, 'Did the Earl of Marlborough rely on English soldiers alone? . . . I find that, though it was stipulated that in order to carry out the plans of the Great Alliance the King should raise an army of 60,000 men, not more than 40,000 were contributed by this country, and of these only 18,000 men were British soldiers!'

The Duke of Wellington, we know, expressed his high sense of the value of the foreign troops in the English service. In a speech on the second reading of the Militia Bill (3 Hansard, CXXII. 730) he says:

The armies of England, which have served the country so well, are your lordships so mistaken as to suppose that they were ever composed of more than one-third of real British subjects—of people of these islands? Look at the East Indies! not one-third of the soldiers there are Britons. Look at the Peninsula! *not* one-third! Yet they fought great battles against the finest troops in the world. Take the battle of Waterloo, look at the number of British troops! I can tell your lordships that in that battle there were sixteen battalions of Hanoverian Militia, newly formed under the command of a nobleman—now the Hanoverian Ambassador in London—Count Kilmansegg, who behaved most admirably, and there were other foreigners in that battle, avowedly a battle of giants!

It was the Dutch Dragoons under Ginkel who quelled the dangerous mutiny at Ipswich. At the battle of the Boyne, it was Solmes's Dutch Blues who first crossed the river breast deep, and drove the Irish before them 'comme des moutons,' as the French General wrote to Louvois.

On another occasion, after praising the conduct of the German troops at Albuera, as in every respect conspicuously good, Wellington speaks with emphatic praise of the Heavy Cavalry Brigade of the German Legion, and adds, 'Will your lordships then say that *for the first time* in the history of this country you will rely on British regiments alone?'

The well-known Colonel Sibthorp did not agree with him. Referring to the Government Bill, for enlisting foreigners, the vituperative Colonel says, 'The measure is an underhand measure, a low, dirty, mean, paltry, cowardly measure!'

And so it was in the American War. The Hessians proved to be excellent soldiers, and contributed greatly to our success, in the beginning of the struggle. At the taking of Fort Washington (Nov. 1776) the Hessians, under Knyphausen, carried off the chief honours of the day. Several Hessian officers were honourably mentioned in the general orders, and the fort was renamed 'Knyphausen.'

At Hubbardton (July, 1777) Colonel Warner was saved from destruction by Riedesel and his Brunswickers; and at the battle of Stillwater the German mercenaries turned the tide of battle in favour of the British army. And alas! when we read the sad story of our subsequent disasters, we can hardly avoid the conviction that had the advice of the Hessian and Brunswick commanders been listened to the result of the war might have been somewhat different.

The Americans, who were in the best position to form a sound opinion, regarded the Hessians with mingled admiration and terror. When 1,000 of them were taken prisoners at Trenton, Washington had them led through the streets that the people might cease to think them invincible.

The traditional fear of the Hessian name still survived in the year 1864. In the address of the Congress of the Southern States to the people, we read: 'The Administration [of Lincoln] has been able,

thus far, *by its legion of Hessian mercenaries*, to overawe the masses, to control the elections, and to establish an arbitrary despotism.'

The general good conduct of the Hessians, the bravery with which they fought in a cause in which they could have no national, political, or sentimental interest, are the more remarkable when we consider the manner in which they were recruited. The German Princes often had great difficulty in fulfilling their contract for supplying men for the English service. Of their own little armies they had, of course, the absolute disposal. But as the demand increased they were often obliged to enrol vagabonds and tramps from all other countries, and to employ a pressgang to kidnap any of their own subjects, who, for some reason, were exempt, but who they thought might be acceptable to Colonel Faucit and other English agents.

We gain a curious insight into the methods employed, and the sentiments of those whom they enticed or forced into the service, from the Autobiography of the German poet Seume. Seume, a man of the humblest origin, attracted in his youth the notice of Count Hohenthal Knauthayn, by whom he was sent to the University of Leipsic. While there he fell into bad odour with his tutors for not attending church, and for expressing heretical opinions. Count Hohenthal withdrew his patronage, and Seume's position became so intolerable that he ran away from Leipsic. He slept the first night at Bach, near Erfurt, and was there seized by the agents of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and sent to the fortress of Ziegenhayn, which was used as a *dépôt* for recruits, of whom he found a strange motley crew awaiting review by Colonel Faucit. Among them were a vagabond student from Jena, a dismissed postmaster from Gotha, a bankrupt merchant from Vienna, a monk from Würzburg, an *Oberamtmann* from Meiningen, a Prussian *Wachtmeister* and a Hessian major.

Very remarkable is the easy-going *insouciance* with which Seume bore the hardships and privations to which he was subjected—the poor and scanty food, the insufficient clothing, the stormy passage to America in the overcrowded ship. It is true that he joined with others in attempts to escape, for which some of his comrades were beaten to death. But when these failed he accepted his fate with cheerful resignation, and was able to look at it on its humorous side. His lot was, perhaps, a little cheered by the officers of his regiment when they found that there was a man of genius in the ranks.

But the good temper and practical philosophy which he displays must have been general among his comrades, for their letters, many of which have been preserved, contain few indications of discontent or ill-temper, and the number of desertions was, under the circumstances, surprisingly small. The Americans, we know, were extremely liberal in their offers of honour and emolument to the Hessian officers and men; and it might naturally be expected that men, many of whom, like Seume, were smarting under a sense of intolerable wrong, would

gladly have accepted them. But in fact the desertion of Germans was not more frequent than that of Englishmen from *their* regiments, and much less frequent than the desertion of Americans from their own army.

To account for this strange fact, we must remember that their lot, as subjects of petty tyrants, was by no means an enviable one. The majority, when once landed in America, found consolation and pleasure in escaping from toil and taxes, in seeing a newer and wider world, and in bearing a part in adventurous enterprises. We find no trace among them of sympathy with the revolted Americans. They report in their letters that the wives of small American farmers were far better dressed than the noblewomen of Germany, and express surprise and indignation at the folly and ingratitude of men who could rebel against a Government under which they were so free and prosperous and happy. They cared nothing about politics, but it seemed to them self-evident that rebels must be brought to reason.

In a letter from a Hessian soldier in Rhode Island to his brother in Hesse-Cassel, after speaking of the beauty and fertility of the land, and the handsome, well-furnished 'English' homes of the inhabitants, he adds, 'it is therefore a pity that so fruitful a country should belong to "solchen b-schen Menschen," who, from sheer wantonness and luxury, do not know what they would be at, and will owe their ruin to their own foolish pride alone. If anyone in Germany takes their part he should, as a fitting punishment, spend a short time among them and become acquainted with their constitution, and he will see, as I do, that nothing but wantonness and crime were the causes of this rebellion.'[1]

Very amusing, in this connection, are the incidental remarks made at this time on a well-known characteristic tendency of the English. 'Why,' asks Herr von Pinto, in his 'Politische Weissagungen,' 'are the English so gloomy in their forebodings of the issue of this war?' Answer: 'Their happy constitution, combined with English spleen, engenders in this nation a peculiar foolish tendency, and makes them the greatest calumniators of themselves. Other Peoples are remarkable for their ridiculous national vanity—they show only their best side, and carefully conceal their defects. The Briton, on the contrary, disparages himself, ignores his own merits, exaggerates his deficiencies, and is always ringing the alarm-bell.'

A member of the Opposition said to Earl Bathurst, 'To-day the nation is ruined.' 'That is impossible,' replied Lord Bathurst, 'for fifty years ago I, in the finest speech I ever made, clearly proved that, *at that time*, the country was irretrievably lost.'

Another letter enlarges on the beauty of the American women, their cleanliness, their free and cheerful manners, and their handsome

[1] Schlözer's *Briefwechsel*, Th. i. p. 107.

dress, of which he gives a detailed account. After something like a panegyric on them, the writer thinks it prudent to conclude with a compliment to his own countrywomen: 'But I must say, for the honour of my own countrywomen, that, in spite of all that I have said of the fair sex in America, I must confess that the soft, languishing, tender air which lends such an amiable charm to the German woman is here very rarely to be found.'

We have already spoken of the eminent services of foreign troops at the battle of Waterloo, and of the high opinion entertained of them by the Duke of Wellington. In 1854 the Duke of Newcastle brought in a Bill for the enlistment of foreigners, which was strongly supported by Lord John Russell, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and other leading politicians. Mr. Watson, an M.P., stated that he had served with the German Legion in Spain, and spoke as an eye-witness of the very valuable services rendered by the 10th Legion of the Duke of Wellington's army. He added that on the death of General Roberts the command fell to General Carl von Alten, a so-called mercenary.

Lord Palmerston, who was strongly in favour of foreign enlistment, reminded the House that in the late war with France we had the aid, not only of the German Legion, but also of Hanoverians, Brunswickers, Portuguese, Swiss, Greeks, Corsicans, and Sicilians.

The difficulty, one may say the impossibility, of obtaining serviceable foreign mercenaries was first experienced at the time of the Crimean war. In 1856 H.B.M. Consul was arrested at Cologne for endeavouring to enlist recruits for the English army; and at Hamburg several persons were tried and convicted of the same offence.

The few recruits that were obtained were of the worst possible character, and were worse than useless. In the same year a collision took place at Shorncliffe between mutinous soldiers of the German Legion and the police. Another mutiny broke out in the Italian Legion at Novara, and Lord Palmerston found it necessary to send it to Malta, because some of the men were taking bribes to desert and escape to Lombardy.

These were nearly the last attempts to enrol foreigners in our army, and we must consider that resource as now closed to us for ever.

A serious consideration in the face of the unpatriotic refusal of the middle and lower classes in England to prepare themselves for the defence of their country!

WALTER COPLAND PERRY.

A DEMOCRAT'S DEFENCE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS

WHEN the House of Lords, some six weeks ago, refused to pass the Government's Education Bill unamended, a great cry of rage arose from the ranks of the Liberal party and threats of direst vengeance immediately filled the air. The emotion was not unnatural. The Liberal party had been well nigh twenty years sitting in the cold shade of Opposition. It had seen its hated rival basking all that time in the sunshine of power, directing policy, and—what was worse—drawing salary, itself unable to participate in either the one or the other. And now, when its turn had at last arrived, it sees its first assertion of authority haughtily repelled, its first great legislative effort thwarted and brought to naught. It admitted—did the Liberal party—that its Education Bill was not perfect, offered concessions, and pleaded hard for an agreement. But the Opposition in the House of Lords are not fools; they are at least a match for His Majesty's present Ministers. They knew that, over the question of religious teaching at all events, they had the Government's head in chancery, and they were not disposed to release it. Therefore, the prayers for a settlement were coldly rejected, and Lord Lansdowne and his supporters 'adhered to their amendments.' The Bill was withdrawn, war was declared, and the Liberal hosts are now presumably preparing for battle. Up to the time of writing, however, nothing definite has happened, the storm has not burst, but the Liberal warriors are possibly, like Mr. Winkle with his skating, 'just going to begin.'

What is the cause of quarrel between the two Houses of Parliament? What are the charges which the Commons make against the Lords? They are, chiefly, two. First, that the Lords, while freely passing measures sent up to them by Conservative Administrations, systematically veto or mutilate those submitted by Liberals. And, second, that the House of Lords, being a non-elected body, has no moral right to obstruct or control legislation. What is the answer of the House of Lords and its friends to these charges? To the first they reply that their action in passing or rejecting measures submitted to them is governed, not by the source from which these

measures emanate, but by the actual character of the measures themselves. To the second, they reply that they have not created the hereditary system, they find it in existence, they believe it is approved by the people, and they are certain that it works out to the welfare of the country. Let us see if these defences can be maintained.

In the first place let us, in order to test the first defence, examine the two principal measures rejected in the late Session—the Plural Voting and Education Bills. Were they measures whose actual character justified their destruction? To begin with, they were both admittedly partisan. In introducing his Education Bill, Mr. Birrell, expounding the clauses which bore hardly on the Church of England, declared that 'minorities must suffer,' while the Minister in charge of the Plural Voting Bill rather plumed himself on the fact that his proposals would weaken his political opponents. Of course, it is quite possible for a Bill to be both partisan and just, for the righting of a wrong may be altogether in the interest of one party and to the detriment of its opponents. And that, no doubt, is the contention of the authors of these two measures. But their contention does not close the argument. The Bills themselves have to be examined and their real character ascertained.

The Liberal Education Bill of 1906 has been so exhaustively discussed, both in these pages and in Parliament, that it is unnecessary to do more now than to glance at one or two of its features, in order to see how far, if at all, the House of Lords was justified in rejecting it. The great fault of that Bill—from the House of Lords' point of view—was that it aimed a blow at the Church of England and, through the Church of England, at religion itself. It sought to take away from the ministers of that Church the influence and control which they have exercised for centuries in the schools of the country and to confer that control on popularly elected bodies. It sought, also, to establish in those schools a sort of secular religion, calculated to suit the taste of atheists and agnostics, but minus the essentials of the Christian faith. That, at all events, was how the new proposals appeared to the members of the House of Lords, and that, undoubtedly, was how they appeared also to the general public. Now, it may be, as some Nonconformists assert, that the clergy of the Church of England are an arrogant and intolerant caste, who domineer over their Dissenting brethren and use the State machinery for their own sectarian ends. But the country is essentially religious, and it has got it into its head that the clergy of the Church of England are its chief stewards in the matter of religious education, and it is not going to agree to any new law which will degrade that body and place it on a lower level (in respect of State recognition) than the Nonconformists. Much fault has been found with the Bishops for their opposition to the Bill. I do not, myself, approve of these Church officials being permitted, as such, to sit in either legislative Chamber; but, being

there, and the facts being as stated, I do not see how they could, without betraying their trust, have acted otherwise than they did.

As regards the new religion—Cowper-Templeism—which it was proposed to substitute for Christianity as the religion of the State, its advocates argued that it was at once so comprehensive and so indefinite that it must be taken to embody the views and satisfy the consciences of the general community; and that, therefore, it and it only should be subsidised by the State and taught in the State schools. But nobody outside the ranks of Nonconformity seriously believes in this argument. Everybody knows that, rightly or wrongly, Cowper-Templeism does not satisfy the demands of the average Christian parent, and everybody, except the Nonconformists themselves, acknowledges that the State endowment of Cowper-Templeism would be the State endowment of Nonconformity. The Nonconformists, in defence of Cowper-Templeism, argue that, inasmuch as it is neither pure secularism nor pure Christianity, but stands midway between, therefore it must satisfy both The argument is hardly conclusive. Mr. A. may like whisky and Mr. B. may like water, but Mr. C. is not therefore justified in insisting that whisky-and-water, his own favourite tipple, shall be the drink of all three, and that Mr. A. and Mr. B. must pay for it whether they drink it or not. These being the chief features of the Bill, I don't think the House of Lords did wrong in proposing amendments which had for their objects the defence of the just rights of the Church of England and the preservation of Christian teaching in the schools. And if the Government, rather than accept such amendments, preferred to abandon its Bill, on it, and not on the House of Lords, must rest the responsibility for such action. The people of this country are entirely in favour of religious education, and if that is the issue that is to be put before them, there can be no doubt as to what the verdict will be.

The other principal measure rejected by the House of Lords—the Plural Voting Bill—was, as I have said, avowedly partisan. It made no pretence of equity or fairness, and was, in my opinion, a very stupid Bill, for, having no possible chance of passing, it was only a gratuitous and useless display of its authors' party spleen. It may be urged that it was part of the policy of filling up the cup, and that it was put forward to gratify that section of the Government's supporters who think the plural vote the greatest of all evils, the one injustice most urgently requiring redress. But the explanation is hardly adequate even from the tactical point of view, for the alienation which the Bill must cause amongst fair-minded men must far outweigh any advantage gained by gratifying a mere handful of malignants. The form of the Bill was doubly unfortunate: it addressed itself to one of the evils in our electoral system which least require alteration, while entirely ignoring all those which everybody agrees demand an immediate remedy. It was a disfranchising Bill,

pure and simple, and the people to be disfranchised were not those whose votes were presumably least valuable—the illiterate and the criminal—but those who have committed the offence of acquiring property in more than one constituency. It mattered nothing that each separate property in each separate constituency was separately taxed, and that one of the most sacred watchwords of the Liberal party has always been 'no taxation without representation.' The plural voters were, as a rule, Conservatives; the Liberal party had, at last, secured an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons; therefore now or never was the time to disfranchise the plural voter. The plural voter must cease to be a plural voter, but he would be graciously permitted to continue a plural tax-payer.

There is another, the University vote, and as it also is, as a rule, Conservative, it also must be abolished. The illiterate voters who, at the heels of their priests, go in droves to the polling booths in Ireland to vote for Separation, are left with their electoral power—disproportioned and excessive as it is—untouched, while the University man, however distinguished, is to have his educational vote taken from him, and be reduced to the level of the illiterate Irish peasant. Such were not Mill's doctrines, and the Plural Voting Bill was a striking illustration of how far modern Radicalism has fallen away from the high principles inculcated by its own philosophic founder fifty years ago.

In tackling the subject of electoral reform, any Government, one would expect, would include the major evils in its field of operations. The minor evils need not be omitted, but the larger ones should at least find a place. I do not, myself, defend the plural property vote—although I do the educational—but I am at one with the majority of my countrymen in considering that the injustice resulting from plural voting is as nothing when compared with the injustice involved in unequal electorates. In the former case, a few voters cast two, or perhaps three, votes each, thus wielding two or three times the electoral power of their neighbours; in the latter, thousands of voters—and these frequently the least fit—cast one vote each, but their one vote gives them ten times the electoral power of the voter in more populous centres. One man one vote, by all means; but one vote one value at the same time. I don't think the Government is ignorant of the views of the country on this subject. I think it knows as well as anybody else that any Bill dealing with electoral reform must, to have any chance of becoming law, include a scheme of Redistribution. That is why I think the Government never intended the Plural Voting Bill to pass, but merely put it forward to humour a small group of its supporters. And in view of the actual character of the Bill, its omissions as well as its inclusions, I think that the House of Lords was quite justified in throwing it into its wastepaper basket.

Having examined the two measures rejected by the House of Lords, and having found that they deserved the fate that befell them, we come next to the assertion that the Upper Chamber, being a non-elected body, has no moral right to obstruct or control legislation. At this point two main questions arise—firstly, is a second Chamber desirable, and, secondly, if it is desirable, how should it be constituted? On the first of these we have not only our own experience to assist us in our judgment, but we have the example of the rest of the civilised world; and the result is a practically universal agreement in favour of a second Chamber. But the agreement, it must be owned, is not quite universal, and some of the dissentients are to be found in the ranks of our own Liberal party. These gentlemen declare that one Chamber, the one in which they at present happen to have a majority, would be quite equal to the task of governing the country; and add that it alone has the right, being an elected body, to undertake that duty. The House of Lords, on the other hand, is, they maintain, an anachronism in the legislative system by reason of its hereditary and irresponsible character, and ought not to be allowed to participate in the work of law-making. Well, these matters, like all others, are best settled by the tests of experience and common-sense. There are many things which, theoretically indefensible, are found to be in practice advantageous. Let us apply those tests to the House of Lords.

No one, I suppose, defends the hereditary principle in legislation. The thing is inconceivable. 'The tenth transmitter of a foolish face' is a jaundiced phrase, but there is undoubtedly a stratum of truth at the bottom of it. The possession of great wealth tempts to emasculating pleasures, and the servile adulation that surrounds rank is well calculated to weaken intellects not too strong at their best. But all peers are not debauchees or imbeciles, and those who are have neither the time nor the inclination to take part in the work of the House of Lords. The master minds in that Assembly, the men who sway its judgment and mould its policy, need not fear comparison with the best men in the House of Commons. Lord Rosebery is an hereditary peer: who is there in the elected Chamber to compare with him? Mr. Timothy Healy is not a fanatical admirer of the Upper House, but even he pointed out to the Prime Minister, during the debates on the Education Bill, the intellectual disadvantages under which the Government's spokesmen would be if they entered upon a quarrel with the House of Lords. In discussing the composition of our second Chamber it is too often forgotten that a considerable number of its members are new creations, men who have shown exceptional ability in their several professions, and who, but for that ability, would not be where they are. I do not at the moment recollect the number of these members or their exact proportion to the whole, but I do know that they take an active part in the proceedings of the House and

exercise a distinct influence on its policy. Under all these circumstances I think we may say that, while the hereditary principle is, in theory, indefensible, it has not, in practice, brought about all the evil results prophesied by its enemies, and that so long as the hereditary element is balanced and held in check by frequent additions of proved patriotism and capacity the permanent interests of the country are in no danger of injury at the hands of its second Chamber.

With respect to the charge of irresponsibility, it is quite true that the members of the House of Lords have no constituencies to face, no free and independent electors to demand an account of their stewardship. But is it quite certain that this irresponsibility is a defect in a second Chamber? The answer seems to be in the negative, for the whole civilised world has taken pains in the constitution of its second Chambers to make the members thereof as irresponsible and as far removed from popular control as possible. And the system seems, on the whole, to have worked well, for, although in some cases discontent has, now and then, been expressed by sections of the communities, in no case has the principle of the system been abandoned. Why, even our own present Radical Government has ordered that, in the new Constitution for the Transvaal, there shall be a second Chamber, and that it shall not be elected by the people but shall be appointed by the Governor, Lord Selborne.

What would our Radical friends have? Would they like a second Chamber subject to the changing moods of an emotional electorate well primed with terminological inexactitudes? or would they like it to be subordinate to the House of Commons, amenable to the disapprobation of Mr. Byles and the reprimand of Mr Swift MacNeill? One would hardly think so, yet the recent memorial to the Lord Chancellor on the subject of magisterial appointments certainly indicated distinct tendencies in that direction. And, as it happens, this very incident of the memorial reveals the value of the 'irresponsible' system, for who that knows the man who was Sir Robert Reid, M.P., can doubt that it is because he is no longer Sir Robert Reid, M.P., but Lord Loreburn, that he has refused to become the mere instrument of a knot of self-seeking partisans, and that if he were still only Sir Robert Reid, M.P., with a constituency to reckon with, his reply to the memorial would have been very different from what it was? The fact of the matter is that this so-called irresponsibility is real responsibility of the weightiest kind. To some men, no doubt, the possession of uncontrolled power is a temptation and a danger, but these are a small minority of mankind. To the majority it is a sacred trust, and is wielded all the more conscientiously because it is uncontrolled.

If one wants a lesson in the evils of the opposite, the 'responsible,' system, he has only to turn to the proceedings of the House of Commons in the past Session. The chief measure of that Session—

after the Education Bill—was the Trade Disputes Act, and no one will pretend that the form in which that Bill finally emerged from the House of Commons was the form it would have borne if the leading members of the Government had been free men, able to give effect to their own judgment. The Bill, as introduced by the Government to the House of Commons contained, as all the world knows, provisions for the continuance of the liability of trade union funds for damage done by union agents in trade disputes. And, as all the world likewise knows, those provisions were not in the Bill when it passed from the House of Commons. And how was the change effected?—how was the purge applied? The story is one of the most humiliating that has ever been told about the British Parliament, the transaction the most discreditable to the House of Commons that has happened for many a long day.

The measure, it must first be remembered, was the work of the entire Cabinet, and, in the second place, it must also be remembered that the subject was not a new one, that it had been debated both in and out of Parliament, at trade union congresses and public meetings and in the press of all parties. And, that being so, the country was entitled to expect that when the Government brought forward its official and formal proposals on the subject, these proposals would represent its matured and definite judgment. But what happened? Two days—only two days—after the Attorney-General had, as the mouth-piece of the Government, introduced the Government's Bill, containing the provision continuing the liability of trade union funds, a rival Bill was introduced by a Labour member, a Bill abolishing the liability, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Attorney-General's chief, rose in his place, threw over his colleague and blessed and adopted the Bill of the Labour member! What shall we say of such conduct? What can we say except that it illustrates, in a glaring manner, the evil of this responsible system that is so highly lauded. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is presumably attached to his convictions and not less naturally honest than his Lord Chancellor. Yet we find the one standing upright and the other kneeling down in the mire. How can we explain the contrast otherwise than as the result of 'responsibility'? Nor was the Premier alone in his recreancy. The Attorney-General himself, after a brief absence caused by illness, returned to the House and formally swallowed all he had said about the iniquity and impossibility of placing the unions above the law. The philosophic Mr. Haldane found it consistent with his philosophy to forget his valiant declarations of defiance to the Labour party, and the stern unbending Chancellor of the Exchequer concluded that he must bend this time if he was to retain the expectation of at some other time succeeding to the leadership of the Liberal party. How Messrs. Asquith and Haldane would have jumped on the immunity clause of the Trade Disputes Bill if they

had only been as 'irresponsible' as their colleague in the Upper House, Lord Loreburn!

Having examined the claims of the House of Lords to take part in the legislation of the country, and found that, notwithstanding its hereditary and irresponsible character, these claims are somewhat substantial, we now turn to those put forward on its own behalf by the House of Commons. And, first, let us note their extensive character. A portion of the House of Commons, it is true, would be content with controlling powers over the House of Lords, but the majority demand the abolition of the Upper House altogether or, at least, its total elimination from the legislative machine. This attitude provokes comparisons, for it involves not only the positive qualifications of the House of Commons for the work of legislation but its superiority in that connection over the House of Lords. Let us see how it comes out of the comparison.

The great argument put forward by advocates of the supremacy of the House of Commons is that it is an elected body. Time after time they call a vote of the House of Commons the will of the people, as if the two things were synonymous. Now, I do not deny that, if election to a seat in the House of Commons were really free, if the members sent to St. Stephen's were the free choice of the electors, then a vote of the House of Commons would be entitled to be regarded as an expression of the will of the people. But that is not the case to-day. I am not referring to the fact that a certain portion of the population are outside the electoral circle. I am speaking of the actual existing voters, and I say that the men these voters send to Parliament are not their own free choice. True they voted for them, but they had no voice in selecting them as candidates; that was done by the party managers; their only choice was to vote for a man they had not selected, to vote for the Opposition candidate, or not to vote at all. And how did these candidates get themselves selected? In every case the essential qualification was the possession of money, of money in at least sufficient quantity to defray all the election expenses. Identity, or at least similarity, of political views with the political views of the party represented was, of course, desirable. But even this condition was not always insisted upon too closely if the other condition, that of wealth, was fully met. I understand that there are one or two men in the House of Commons—Mr. John Morley for one—whose constituencies have borne the entire expenses of their election; but, with these exceptions, every man there has bought, with hard cash, the seat he occupies. How can such men pretend to represent the will of the nation, or claim to have their individual opinions treated with exceptional consideration? They represent only their own money-bags, *plus* the demands of election agents and a system which denies to the average elector any real voice in the selection of his Parliamentary representative.

Now, if a balance is to be struck and comparison made between the average member of the House of Commons and the average member of the House of Lords in their capacities either as men or legislators, who shall say that the advantage is with the former? If the accident of birth is no qualification for the exercise of power—and all democrats are agreed that it is not—is the possession of wealth a better title? Is it more meritorious to buy a seat in Parliament than to be born to it? And would the welfare of the country be safer in the hands of, say, Mr. W. H. Lever and Mr. Harry Marks than in those of Lord Lansdowne and the Marquis of Ripon? Opinions may differ on this point, for some men may prefer financial adventurers and successful soap boilers to mere landowners; but so far as representative capacity is concerned, it is clear that there is not a pin to choose between the one and the other. The fact is that neither House is truly representative of the people. But they are at least equal to the legislatures of other lands, and if they do not go forward as quickly as some of us would wish, they make no attempt to go backward. The House of Lords is by no means the least popular of the two, and when it is threatened by the House of Commons it may well reply, in the words said to have been addressed by Charles the Second to his brother James, 'The people will never kill me to make you king.'

It is not, however, to be expected that this view of the comparative merits of the two Houses will commend itself either to the members of the Government or to their more ardent supporters, and the latter *may be trusted to force the Ministers to definite action. But what* is that action to be? Some counsellors, whose frugal instincts would appear to be stronger than their sense of humour, suggest the stoppage of supplies for the Upper Chamber, in order, it is to be supposed, that their lordships' servants shall be made to join the ranks of the unemployed and so be punished for their masters' sins. Another group, who have found a ready mouth-piece in an incorrigible busybody, warmly advocate a wholesale creation of peers pledged to support the Government and in sufficient numbers to swamp the existing Conservative majority. A third is content to echo the old demand that the Lords' veto shall be effective for only one Session; while the Prime Minister himself, like the cautious Scot he is, shrouds his purpose in a convenient haze, declaring only that a way can be found, and will be found, to make the will of the people—that is the will of the Liberal Government—prevail. But the question is, can any of these plans be carried out? And if they could, would they effect the object in view?

The first hardly requires notice. The peers are not paid for the performance of their legislative duties, and such slight expenditure as might be required for fire, lighting, and attendance in their Chamber would probably be cheerfully furnished by themselves if found necessary. As to the proposed limitation of the power of the veto to one

Session, it is difficult to perceive any rational or logical argument in its favour. Of course, if a General Election took place between the first and second time of asking and the country endorsed the policy of the Government, that would be different, for the voice would then be the voice of the country—or as near it as we can get under present conditions—and not the mere vote of a majority of the House of Commons. But, unless a General Election has taken place between the two Sessions, there is no sense in the proposal. The repetition by a majority of the House of Commons of a demand it had made some time previously is no evidence of a popular mandate, but only of said majority's obstinacy or faithfulness to convictions, as the onlooker may regard it. The constituencies have not been consulted. If they had been, it is possible that they would have disapproved of the Government's policy. But, be that as it may, the fact is that, in the plan suggested, they are not consulted, and, that being so, it is difficult to see what can be said in its defence.

The other suggestion, that a sufficient number of peers should be created to swamp the existing Conservative majority, is too ridiculous to contemplate. What guarantee is there that the new peers, once made, would not side with the majority? The late Mr. Gladstone tried the plan on a small scale, but with disastrous results. While denouncing the House of Lords for all its manifold sins, he steadily recruited its ranks, making more peers than any other Prime Minister before or since. But it was all in vain. No sooner did his nominees enter the gilded chamber than they forgot their benefactor and deserted to the enemy. Is Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman quite sure that his men would not do the same? Will the apprentice succeed where the master workman failed? Are his men better men than Mr. Gladstone's, or does he fancy that the allurements of caste are less powerful to-day than they proved twenty years ago? No, there will be no wholesale creation of peers. Sir Henry's sense of the ludicrous, if nothing else, is ample security against such a farce. That 'a way will be found to make the will of the people prevail' is possible enough, but this will not be the way.

The Liberals profess to believe that the country is with them in their quarrel with the Lords. If that belief is sincere, if the Government really believe that the country approves of the Education Bill which the Lords have rejected, why does it not prove its case by submitting the question to the constituencies? There are, of course, objections to a General Election. It costs time and money. But the time would be well spent from the Government's point of view if the result was a clear mandate in favour of the late Education Bill, and as to the expense the vast majority of the members of the Liberal party could well afford it. It may be said that it might hit the Labour party rather hard and that some of its members might not, for lack of funds, be re-elected. But I do not think the Liberal party or

Liberal Government would be inconsolable in that event; that Mr. Whiteley would cry his eyes out if, say, Mr. Hardie lost his seat at Merthyr. As to the Liberal-Labour men, the Government need have no anxiety on their account. Most of them are supported by Unions possessing tens of thousands of pounds; the others, faithful in their services to the Liberal party, can always rely on assistance from that quarter. And if it is urged that there was a General Election only a year ago, it must be remembered that shorter Parliaments is an article in the Radical creed, even annual Parliaments being advocated by many. But I am afraid that time and expense are not the real obstacles in Liberal eyes to a General Election. I fancy that the Government is not quite sure that the verdict would be in its favour and so it shrinks from the encounter. It talks loudly about not going to be 'forced' into an election by the House of Lords, very much as Falstaff protested that he would not 'on compulsion' explain the lies he had told Prince Hal about the men in buckram. Nobody is deceived, and the Government might just as well confess to the truth of the matter. It dare not appeal to the people, everybody knows it dare not appeal; and that is a very bad and damaging state of affairs for the Government.

The task of the Government in starting a campaign against the House of Lords has been rendered extremely difficult, if not absolutely impossible, by reason of a misfortune which befell it in the course of the past Session. In its diligent pursuit of the policy of filling up the cup it bethought itself of the Trade Disputes Bill and, more particularly, its immunity clause. Here was indeed a trump card, for the Lords could not possibly pass such a Bill or such a clause. Nonconformist indignation over the loss of the Education Bill was well enough in its way, but it was too obviously partisan to be of much value in a national struggle. But the voice of Labour was a different thing, and if it could be secured, as it obviously must, over the destruction of the Trade Disputes Bill, why, the overthrow of the House of Lords was as good as accomplished. So the word was passed along the Liberal benches where sit Sir Christopher Furness, Sir John Brunner, and other friends of the working class, that they might vote for the hateful Bill without misgiving, for 'the stupid party' in the House of Lords would be certain to throw it out. But, alas, 'the best laid schemes of mice and men gang aft agley,' and 'the stupid party' actually passed the Bill! And now there are gnashings of teeth in counting-houses and bitter recriminations in Mr. Whiteley's room at the House of Commons, for the unfortunate Government has been baulked of its expected grievance.

There are not many people who defend, upon its merits, the immunity clause in the Trade Disputes Bill. I certainly do not. But that was not the real question submitted to the House of Lords. The real question was whether the House was content to be the cat's

paw of Liberal employers of labour, sitting in another House, either afraid or unwilling to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for themselves and their lordships, in my opinion, showed not only a proper self-respect, but great wisdom, in declining to perform the task. Possibly the House of Lords thought that it was desirable to teach these Liberal employers of labour in the House of Commons a lesson: the lesson, namely, that if they desire to see labour legislation obstructed they must do their dirty work themselves: the House of Lords is not going to do it for them. When that lesson is learned and put into practice several masks will be taken off in the House of Commons, and quite a number of erstwhile 'friends of the workers' come out in new and startling colours.

For their action in passing the Trade Disputes Bill the Lords have been roundly abused by the authors of that measure. Their wrath over it is even greater than their distress over the rejection of the Education Bill. In speeches and newspaper articles without number the 'infamy' of the Tory party's 'surrender to Labour' is pointed out, and the country called upon to reprobate such unprincipled conduct. But the country is unmoved, or, at most, smiles to think that 'the stupid party,' for once in a way, has outwitted its opponents. In defending the course taken, Lord Lansdowne pointed out that that course was in conformity with the spirit of the Constitution, which required the House of Lords to give effect to the wishes of the people when clearly expressed. He added that he did not approve of the Bill, but, recognising that it had been endorsed by the constituencies at the late General Election, he advised the House to pass it.

This constitutional interpretation of its powers, this recognition that it ought not and must not continuously oppose the definitely expressed wishes of the nation, is the chief security of the House of Lords. Without it, its existence would not be worth a year's purchase. With it the English people will condone much obstruction and delay. Firstly, because they themselves are naturally slow of movement and like their legislation to be the same. And, secondly and chiefly, knowing that, whenever they desire to quicken the pace, they have, within themselves, the power to give effect to their wishes.

The acceptance by the House of Lords of the Trade Disputes Bill has, therefore, from this point of view, given the greatest satisfaction to the country, which, although it may not altogether approve of the Bill itself, recognises in that action a tribute to and acknowledgment of its own supreme power. After that acknowledgment has been made, it will be difficult for the Liberal party to inflame the nation against the Upper House. The nation will not be inflamed. Here and there, no doubt, the voice of the partisan will be heard denouncing the peers for their 'defiance of the people's will' and prophesying their speedy downfall. But the voice will be so obviously partisan that its utterances will be discounted and nobody will pay much

attention. The spokesmen of the Labour party have shown a just appreciation of the situation. One of the ablest and most influential of them openly thanks the House of Lords for throwing out the Nonconformist Education Bill, while others, more cautious, content themselves with an expression of satisfaction that the peers recognise and respect the claims of Labour. 'Though they mutilated the Education Bill beyond recognition,' says one Labour M.P., 'and afterwards unceremoniously rejected the Plural Voting Bill, they dealt tenderly with those measures with which the Democracy are immediately concerned. The Trade Disputes Bill, Workmen's Compensation and Provision of Meals Bill afford striking testimony of their unwillingness to undertake a quarrel with the great industrial army.' Another scouts the suggestion that the Labour party should join in the proposed Liberal crusade against the House of Lords, and unkindly hints that such crusade is likely to be used by the Liberal party as a pretext for the indefinite postponement of those promised social and industrial measures which the workers demand, but which the bulk of the Liberal party is unwilling to carry out. From all of which it is clear that, unless some fresh issue is raised, some more alluring bait than Cowper-Templeism in the schools and the supremacy of the illiterate voter at the polls, the Labour party will not join in the proposed crusade. And it needs no prescience to foretell that a crusade from which the Labour party stands aloof is, in these days, foredoomed to failure.

M. Maltman Barrie.

The Editor of The Nineteenth Century *cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER



No. CCCLXI—MARCH 1907

REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS

AGITATION for the purpose of ending or mending the House of Lords is no new thing; it has been sporadic for many generations, yet the House of Lords still exists as a branch of the Legislature, sometimes violently condemned for thwarting the will of the people as represented in the elected Chamber, and sometimes enthusiastically applauded for furthering the will of the people misrepresented in the elected Chamber. The outcry against the House of Lords is always raised when the party in office is composed of legislators in a desperate hurry, and the matter might be left with that illuminating explanation, but, for many reasons, it may be well to examine into the nature and validity of the alleged grievance, and also to point out that, owing to exceptional circumstances, it is desirable that steps should be taken to strengthen the Upper House by reasonable reform.

It may be premised that the present agitation is really directed against the double Chamber system, and cannot be appeased by mending or reforming the House of Lords; and, to still further clear the ground, it should be noted that the terms Upper and Lower House, or First Chamber and Second Chamber, are merely expressions in common use, and have no political or constitutional validity. The two branches of the one Legislature are co-equal. Their powers

and functions are, with one exception, identical. The House of Commons can do what it pleases with all Bills coming from the House of Lords; it can accept, amend, or reject them. The House of Lords can do what it pleases with all Bills coming to it from the House of Commons, with the exception of money Bills. It can accept, amend, or reject all other Bills, and it can accept or reject money Bills, but it cannot, or, to be perhaps more strictly accurate, it does not, amend them. Therefore, except in the matter of amending Bills affecting taxation, the two Houses are in their powers and functions co-equal and co-extensive, and the terms applied to them in common parlance are misleading. The expression Upper House conveys no superiority over Lower House, nor does First Chamber imply any superiority over Second Chamber.

Judging by platform speeches, the exuberant utterances of popular orators, and the more measured complaints of statesmen and politicians capable of exercising some self-control, the charge against the House of Lords resolves itself into the expression of the two following opinions. First, that it is outrageous that the will of the people as expressed in the branch of the Legislature elected by the people should be overruled by the branch of the Legislature that is composed of hereditary scions of 'an effete aristocracy.' Second, that, owing to the predominance of one of the great political parties in the House of Lords, legislation is easy when that party has a majority in the House of Commons, and difficult when it has not. There are three distinct counts in this indictment—namely, first that the body overruling the will of the people is an incompetent body; second, that the will of the people is overruled by any body; and third, that the political complexion of the existing body is overpoweringly Conservative. Let us examine into these points.

As to the *personnel* of the House of Lords and the qualifications which its members may claim to possess as legislators, the case against them has been thus stated by a Cabinet Minister with remarkable force. Speaking with all the weight and authority attaching to his exalted position, and presumably with a full sense of his consequent responsibility, the President of the Board of Trade said at Newcastle-on-Tyne on the 23rd of January last:

> What was the use of Liberal enterprise if the work of Liberalism was to be frustrated by a House chosen by nobody, which was representative of nobody, and which was accountable to nobody? He hoped that, now they had begun to ask that question, they would insist upon an answer. . . . The House of Lords was the refuge and hope of all the forces that stood between the people and the harvest. Legalised greed and social selfishness in every shape and form had their bodyguard in the Peers.

It is quite unnecessary to question the accuracy or good taste of Mr. Lloyd George's opinion that 'legalised greed and social selfishness' are the actuating principles of the House of Lords; but, though

admitting, of course, that the Peers are 'chosen by nobody' in the sense that they are not elected by the people, I directly traverse the statement that they are 'representative of nobody' and are 'accountable to nobody.' Of what elements is the House of Lords composed? There are about six hundred Peers eligible to take their seats. This body contains 172 members who have held office under the State exclusive of Household appointments, 166 who have sat in the House of Commons, 140 who are, or have been, mayors or county councillors, about forty who are members of the legal profession, and about the same number of men eminent in art, science, letters, invention, manufacture, and trade; 207 have served, or are serving, in the Army or Navy. Furthermore, it must be added that, in addition to those who have acquired merit and knowledge as chairmen of railway companies, and in other positions of an analogous character, the great majority have developed business habits, and have derived valuable experience of men and matters in the management of large estates and complicated affairs.

But it may be said that an analysis of the whole body of the peerage does not give an accurate indication of the capacity of the House as a legislative body. That is to some extent true. Of the Peers some must be excluded, such as princes of the blood royal, minors, and those who through age or infirmity cannot attend the sittings of the House; and there are others who, for one reason or another, are not interested in politics, and do not take part in the business of the House. A fairer estimate of the character of the House of Lords as a legislative Chamber can perhaps be obtained by an investigation of the working members of the House—of those attending and voting on occasions deemed to be of great national importance. The record division took place on the second reading of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, but an examination into the qualifications of the Peers voting on a division that took place fourteen years ago would not afford a sound criterion as to the merits or demerits of the House as it exists to-day. It would be better, therefore, to inquire into the composition of the House during the late discussion on the Education Bill. The largest division took place on the 29th of October, when 312 Peers voted. Three days were devoted to the second reading debate at the end of July, and the House was occupied with the committee and subsequent stages of the Bill from the 25th of October till the 19th of December. Altogether twenty-six working days were devoted to the Bill. During the whole of that time the attendance was very large. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the full attendance and great interest shown afford cogent argument in favour of autumn sessions. Perfectly accurate figures cannot be arrived at, but I think in estimating the number of Peers who attended the sittings of the House during the autumn session at about 380 I shall about hit the mark; and I take that number as fairly indica-

tive of the full working strength of the House for all practical purposes. Let us look into the composition of that body in its salient features. It contained the Lord Chancellor and an ex-Lord Chancellor, an ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, four Lords of Appeal, and twenty-seven other Peers associated with the legal profession, including a number who have held high judicial office; seven ex-Viceroys of India and Ireland; sixteen ex-Governors of the great colonies, or provinces of India; fifteen other Peers who have held high positions in the diplomatic and civil services, sixty-two ministers and ex-ministers, thirty-seven Peers who are, or have been, intimately connected with manufacture or trade, science or invention, 123 who have sat in the House of Commons, about eighty who occupy, or have occupied, the position of mayors or members of county councils, and twenty-one archbishops and bishops concerning whom it must be remembered that, whatever may be thought of the principle of spiritual Peers, they do not represent the hereditary principle, and have all served a long apprenticeship in humble positions, from that of a curate upwards, which have brought them in close contact with all classes of the people.

With this brief review before us, it must, I think, be admitted that the House of Lords includes a very large number of members who, through long and distinguished service rendered in various walks of life, have acquired that deep knowledge of human nature, that wide experience of human affairs, and that intimate acquaintance with administrative detail which are so desirable in any legislative body. The House has no directly representative character gained at the polls, but it cannot be denied that it is, in fact, though not in theory, very fully representative of the great activities which in their various phases constitute our national life. The thesis that the House of Lords is representative of nobody cannot be maintained; nor is its position accurately described in the statement that it is accountable to nobody. The House of Lords makes no claim to enforce its views upon the people. It fully realises the limitations of its powers; it freely acknowledges that the will of the people must prevail, and that its function is to see that the real will of the people does prevail. Far from being accountable to nobody, it is accountable to everybody, and it is acutely sensible of the fact.

The second count in the indictment is that the will of the people as expressed in the elected Chamber is overruled. That opens up two questions—the desirability of a Second Chamber, and the extent to which public opinion is reflected in the Commons' House of Parliament and in the legislative proposals of the Cabinet.

On the first point, argument is perhaps superfluous. Unquestionably the whole consensus of educated opinion in the United Kingdom is in favour of a Second Chamber; the principle has been approved and adopted in our great self-governing colonies, in the

United States, and, in fact, throughout the world wherever democratic systems obtain; the belief in the necessity of a revising Chamber in order to ensure that the permanent opinion of the people may receive adequate expression is practically universal. Nevertheless, the opinions of two or three high authorities may be quoted. The whole controversy as to the advisability of retaining the Second Chamber was admirably stated by Lord Beaconsfield over thirty years ago:

> For a century, ever since the establishment of the Government of the United States, all great authorities—American, German, French, Italian—have agreed in this, that a representative Government is impossible without a second Chamber. . . . However anxious foreign countries have been to enjoy this advantage, that anxiety has only been equalled by the difficulty which they have found in fulfilling their object. How is this second Chamber to be constituted? By nominees of the sovereign power? What influence can be exercised by a chamber of nominees? It is a proverb of general disrespect. Are they to be supplied by popular election? In what manner are they to be elected? If by the same constituency as the popular body, what claims have they, under such circumstances, to criticise or to control the decisions of that body? If they are to be elected by a more select body, qualified by a higher franchise, there immediately occurs the objection, why should the elected majority be governed by the elected minority? The United States of America were fortunate in finding a solution of this difficulty; but the United States of America has elements to deal with which never occurred before, and never probably will occur again, because they formed their illustrious Senate from the materials that were offered them by the thirty-seven Sovereign States. We, gentlemen, have the House of Lords, an Assembly which has historically developed itself in an ancient nation, and periodically adapted itself to the wants and necessities of the time.

Later, Mr. Gladstone, when introducing his second Home Rule Bill, enunciated once more a universal opinion when in advocating the institution of a Second Chamber for his new Irish constitution, he stated that 'The first effect of a Second Chamber was to present an undoubted and unquestionable security against hasty legislation,' because 'it interposed a certain period of time, and gave opportunity for reflection and for full consideration.' In the following year Lord Rosebery, speaking on behalf of the Liberal party, affirmed that he was a 'Second Chamber man' and he added:

> I am not for the uncontrolled Government of a single Chamber, any more than I am for the uncontrolled government of a single man. The temptation of absolute power is too great for any man or any body of men, and I believe, though I am speaking from recollection, that so keen and ardent a Radical as John Stuart Mill held this opinion too. I am also strongly of opinion that all experience points to having a second chamber of some sort.

The necessity of a Second Chamber is recognised by all democratic communities, whether under a monarchical or republican form of rule, and the functions, duties, and powers appertaining to it are determined by the mere fact of its existence. A Second Chamber

exactly reflecting the opinion and expressing the voice of the First Chamber would be a gross absurdity. To justify its existence, it must exercise the function of revision; it must ensure that the sober, well-considered wishes of the people prevail; it must act as the fly-wheel or governor of the legislative machine. This is the function which Second Chambers discharge throughout the world, in Republics such as France and the United States, and throughout the British Empire, under a monarchical régime. A Second Chamber always saying ditto to the First Chamber would exercise no check on ill-considered proposals, and would be merely a ridiculous fly upon the legislative wheel. Mr. Bryce stated the case succinctly when he remarked during a former House of Lords campaign:

> It is said that two Chambers do not always work harmoniously together. My observation on that is, that the object of having two Chambers is to secure not that things shall always work smoothly between them, but that they shall frequently differ, and provide a means of correcting such errors as either may commit.

How far the present House of Lords fulfils the duties of a Second Chamber will be dealt with presently. Let us first consider the second question—namely, the extent to which the Commons' House of Parliament reflects public opinion, and the legislative proposals of the Cabinet reflect the opinion of the Commons' House of Parliament. In order to carry on the business of the country, we are bound to assume as a working hypothesis that the majority in the elected Chamber represents the views of the constituencies and indicates their strength; and that the measures introduced by the Government are in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the elected Chamber. But even under ordinary circumstances such are the inconsistencies and anomalies of our electoral system and of our method of government by party that it must be admitted the assumption is sometimes capable of demonstration, is at other times capable of disproof, and generally is of an hypothetical character. Facts and experience compel the admission that the weight and volume of public opinion cannot always be gauged by comparison with the dimension of majorities in the House of Commons, and that that branch of the Legislature sometimes ceases to vibrate to popular sentiment and at others mirrors outbursts of popular feeling of a very transient character. Such is the case under ordinary conditions, but the circumstances are at present somewhat extraordinary. At the last election, 5,632,201 votes were polled. Ignoring Irish Nationalist members and uncontested seats, and dividing opinion roughly into supporters of the Government and supporters of the Opposition, 3,133,486 votes were cast for the former, and 2,463,606 votes for the latter—giving a majority of 669,880 votes in favour of the Government. The supporters of the Government in the country were in the proportion of about six to five. But the Government have a majority of 273,

excluding Nationalists, in the House of Commons; in other words, the supporters of the Government in the House are in the proportion of nearly three to one. It is obvious, therefore, that Radical opinion in the country is vastly exaggerated, if it be estimated by reference to the Radical majority in the House of Commons.

The composition of that majority and the conspiring causes of its existence must be considered. The Prime Minister is supported in the House of Commons by a majority huge numerically, but being of a composite character, and even to some extent antagonistic, strategically weak and lacking in elements of permanence. The party has been returned to power after a long period of 'wandering in the wilderness,' during which it was debarred from legislative action, but by no means from promises of legislation. Partly owing to the swing of the pendulum, partly through the Englishman's sporting desire 'to give the other side a chance,' partly because the Conservative party fell into a comatose condition, evincing more tenacity in clinging to power than forethought or constructive energy, the present Ministry suddenly found itself in office with a load of twenty years' promises burdening it. With the best of intentions Liberal leaders must find considerable difficulty in meeting all their promissory notes; and the holders are reluctant to renew, being probably doubtful as to the permanent character of the Government majority. They must know that it is held together by threads of varying thickness, and at any moment events may occur severing the cord of sympathy which unites this faction or that to the main body of the party. Moreover, as all men who have glanced at party political history are well aware, once the pendulum of popular opinion begins to move against Radicalism in the ascendency, it gathers momentum rapidly, and therefore there is every probability that the present majority in the House of Commons is representative of the fleeting rather than the durable feelings of the country.

When events placed the fruits of office in the hands of the Liberal party, and the present Cabinet was formed, they appear to have been somewhat unprepared to place in concrete form the constructive or destructive legislation of which they had spoken in the abstract so long and so airily upon platforms up and down the country. It is one thing to advocate sweeping reforms in a stump speech at a public meeting; but it is quite another matter to codify those ideas into workable Acts of Parliament. In the process of crystallisation the original proposals are apt to undergo many changes, with the result that the final product bears only a slight resemblance to the rough matter which has served for platform purposes. Illustrations of this unpreparedness of the Liberal party for legislation may be found in the history of the Education Bill, in the tale of Chinese labour, and in the attitude of the Liberal party towards the preferential trade arrangement suggested to this country by the self-governing colonies. The Educa-

tion Bill was introduced to remedy a Nonconformist grievance, and Nonconformity openly rejoiced when the House of Lords rejected the Bill, because the measure as it left the House of Commons differed so widely from that on which they had fixed their hopes. As a further illustration, the extraordinary attitude of the Government towards Chinese labour, acquiesced in by their party, may be taken. The General Election was greatly influenced by the grossest misrepresentation on this point, or, as Mr. Winston Churchill would phrase it, by indulgence in 'terminological inexactitudes.' The Chinese coolies were said to have been enticed to South Africa under false pretences, to have been immured in that country under conditions of slavery, and to have been subjected to restrictions of their liberty, to forms of punishment, and varieties of atrocities inhuman in their character. The imaginations of the least-educated voters were inflamed by cartoons of a character unparalleled in political warfare in this country. What has happened since the Government assumed the reins? Chinese labour is still employed in the mines in South Africa; until within a few weeks past, fresh batches of coolies have been arriving. Soon after taking office, the Government announced its determination to leave this question to the decision of the representative Government about to be set up in the Transvaal, and the latest developments point to a combination between Britisher and Boer to extend the system of importation. Public opinion was deeply stirred by the denunciations of Chinese coolie labour during the late General Election, yet Chinese coolies are still employed in the Transvaal, and it seems certain that they will continue to be employed; and public opinion makes no sign. Further examples may be found in the changed attitude of the Government towards the approaching Colonial Conference, and in the efforts which have been made to follow in the footsteps of the late Foreign Secretary at the imminent risk of giving deadly offence to those patriots who, during Mr. Balfour's administration, were so insistent in their demands that the British fleet should proceed overland to settle difficulties in the Balkan provinces. Since the present Government came into office, we have heard little or nothing of the state of affairs in Macedonia, because the troubles in this part of Europe have served their political purpose, and have automatically fallen into the background.

The Government cannot fail to realise that such experiences as I have enumerated damp the enthusiasm of the less enlightened of their supporters, and that their legislative performances are likely to fall far short of the pledges which were so freely given at the polls. The result is that they are in a desperate hurry to force through measures to which they are pledged with as little critical examination as possible, lest they should fail to carry with them the conviction of the country, and they are not indisposed to shift the blame for their shortcomings on to the shoulders of the House of Lords. The Government are forced

into impetuous action to placate their impetuous supporters in the country, who very naturally object to delay because they fully realise that to them delay is dangerous.

I have no desire to cavil at the present Government. On the contrary, I wish them well. In their Irish legislation they have laid down a programme which, if they succeed in carrying it out, as I most earnestly hope they may, will, to their horror and dismay, hand them down to posterity as the most conservative Ministry that we have seen in many years. They will have done more than any Government has ever done in the direction of wise reform and in establishing the Empire by strengthening the heart of it. I regret to see them embarking on a crusade against the House of Lords. It will fail because the real desire is to deprive the nation of any check upon hasty legislation, and there never was an occasion when the necessity for such a check is more self-evident or could be more easily proved. The House of Commons is not always a faithful mirror. It had ceased to be so during the closing years of the late *régime*, and the present House, on the election promises of its members, cannot substantiate its claim.

The origin of the clamour that the House of Lords must be ended or mended is to be found in the fact that Radical leaders fear lest the good sense of the people will revolt against Radical promises when put into concrete shape and held in suspense long enough for the nation to consider them. The more reasonable members of the party urge amendment of the House, but the larger section are impatient with half measures and claim that this check upon ill-considered and partially considered legislation should be entirely swept away, leaving the affairs of the Empire, and not merely of the United Kingdom, at the mercy of the passing mood of a narrow majority of the electors of the United Kingdom. The ending of the House of Lords is desired not in the permanent interest of the community, but in the temporary interest of one political party, who suspect that their theories do not commend themselves to the mature judgment of the people.

The third count in the indictment of the House of Lords is to the effect that it is permanently and overwhelmingly Conservative. That is a fact, and a fact greatly to be regretted; but no remedy suggests itself to me. The predominance of one of the two great political parties has not always been the case. Parties in the past have been fairly balanced. There have been Whig majorities and Tory majorities; but of late the difference between the two branches of the Legislature tends to become accentuated. It does not follow that the Second Chamber is entirely or principally to blame. Formerly, public opinion underwent a thorough filtering process in the House of Commons; now, owing to pressure of business and other reasons, it reaches the House of Lords in cruder form. Bills come up half baked. The necessity for revision in one Chamber is in proportion to the

hurry exhibited in the other. If one may venture on forecast, the predominance of one set of general political opinions is assured in the House of Lords for some time. As an inevitable consequence, when the branches of the Legislature are of the same political complexion and pull in the same direction, a legislative spring-tide occurs, and the stream flows with easy rapidity; when the forces of the two Houses are exerted in the opposite directions, a neap tide occurs, and the current of legislation is reduced to very small dimensions. Whether this state of things is remediable or not, depends upon the view that is entertained as to the character of modern Radical legislation, and as to the functions of a Second Chamber. That a very great change, whether for better or for worse, has occurred in the conception of Liberalism cannot be denied. For decades and centuries Liberalism stood up for individual liberty, and urged the abolition of class privilege; now its *rôle* seems to be to fetter individual liberty, and to create class privilege. All Second Chambers, and probably, above all, our Second Chamber, adapt themselves to permanent national changes and requirements, but the tendency of modern Liberalism is to be in a desperate hurry in working revolutions; it appears to have no confidence in itself or in the persistence of its principles; and, if it be conceded that the legitimate function of a Second Chamber is to give pause to the people for reflection, it may well be inevitable that a Second Chamber, however constituted, will find itself perpetually lagging behind the aspirations and requirements of Radical thought. It is upon this phase of the question that the Government are concentrating themselves. They are not concerned with reform of the House of Lords. The fact which they 'have under consideration with a view to a solution of the difficulty' is that 'unfortunate differences between the two Houses' have arisen; and, as Lord Ripon has explained, the differences arise from the fact that, whereas party majorities fluctuate in the House of Commons, one party has a permanent and overwhelming majority in the House of Lords. A solution of the difficulty can only be found in one of four ways:

(1) The political, social, and economic conceptions of the two parties in the country may be brought to something like a common denomination. This solution may, I think, be dismissed; at any rate, for some time to come. (2) A balance of political opinion may be created in the House of Lords. (3) A limit of time may be placed upon the suspensory powers of the House of Lords. (4) The House of Lords may divest itself of party liveries.

It is difficult to see how political opinion can be balanced in the Upper House. So far as I can ascertain, during the last sixty or so years—that is, during two generations of men—the creations of Peers under Liberal administrations have numbered 238 as against 181 under Conservative administrations, out of a total House to-day of 606; yet, in spite of this great preponderance of Liberal creations, the

House remains largely Conservative. The 'atmosphere' of a Chamber whose duty it is to act as the 'governor' of a legislative machine produces its natural and inevitable result. It would require the creation of nearly 300 Liberal Peers to restore anything like equilibrium now, and, judging by experience, another batch would be required before long. Numbers would become excessive; the Crystal Palace or Olympia would be required to accommodate the House of Lords. A time limit seems equally out of the question, yet the utterances of the Prime Minister seem to point in that direction. The Prime Minister is quite explicit as to his views. He is not concerned with the constitution of the revising House. His sole object is to put a statutory limit to the suspensory power of that House, however it be constituted; and he surmises that the task will be easier than is generally supposed. That may well be, for to many the difficulty will appear insurmountable, and yet the task may prove so difficult as to tax human ingenuity to the utmost.

Our system is representative, as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman truly observes, and the object of a representative system is that the true will of the people shall prevail. It is the *represented not the representatives* who have to be considered in devising limitations on the Second Chamber. It would be of no avail to place a time limit on the action of the House of Lords with the sole object of giving the House of Commons an opportunity for reflection. How is the opinion of the House of Commons to be affected? or a compromise arrived at? It might be attempted by a reversion to ancient custom, by the two Houses sitting, arguing, and voting together during the suspensory period; but an arrangement of that nature would afford no opportunity to the electorate to reconsider their opinions and express their views. The constituencies are the ultimate court of appeal, and the Second Chamber grants a stay of execution in order that the case may reach them; delay is for their benefit, not for the benefit of the First Chamber. The *Referendum* is unknown to us, and is not likely to be adopted. The only appeal to the people at our disposal is by the costly and inconvenient method of a General Election. Our Second Chamber has, as we know, no wish to thwart the will of the people; all that it desires to do is to ensure that the true, well-considered will of the people shall prevail. At present it has to rely upon its common sense and powers of observation to decide whether any particular measure has or has not that sanction behind it, with the verdict of a General Election to decide the question in the last resort. If for this condition of things statutory limits are to be placed upon the Second Chamber, they must be accompanied by some device for voicing the will of the constituencies. If Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman can invent such a device he will, I am sure, meet with universal support, but without it 'mending' the House of Lords will be synonymous with 'ending' it; the Second Chamber would become a mere farce, and the country would be under

the despotism of possibly a very small and possibly a very transient majority in the Commons' House of Parliament.

A partial solution might be found if the members of the House of Lords could release themselves from party obligations and would judge Bills brought before them purely on their merits and without any reference whatever to party considerations. That is, I fear, a counsel of perfection, for rule by party is firmly engrafted upon the national character and our system of government. Nevertheless it is greatly to be desired that the House of Lords should evince a more detached and more independent attitude and spirit, for unquestionably it has been seriously damaged in the eyes of the people by the alleged interference of the late Prime Minister in dictating to the House of Lords the acceptance of the Trades Disputes Bill and the rejection of the Education Bill. The British canon of fair play shrinks from the conception of an ex-Prime Minister, with a vast majority against him in the House of Commons, pursuing his policy by appeal to party allegiance in 'another place.' A shrewd suspicion is abroad that if the Lords had acted on their own judgment they would have insisted on amendments to the Trades Disputes Bill, and would not have utterly refused a compromise on the Education Bill. What the country desires to see in the revising House is not tactical dexterity, but a judgment unbiassed by party considerations on the merits of the measures submitted to it.

The character of the *personnel* of the House of Lords has already been alluded to, and it only remains to consider the estimate they have formed of their functions and duties. That they have arrived at a sound conception of the duties of a revising Chamber, and thoroughly understand their powers and the limitations upon them, must, I think, be conceded. The lines laid down by the responsible leaders of that House have been frankly accepted. They have been formulated on many occasions, and by no one better than by Lord Lansdowne on the 5th of October last, at Perth, when he said :

> What the House of Lords claimed was not the right to obstruct; it did claim, and it meant to exercise, the right of revising measures that came up to them from the other House of Parliament. And let him say that process of revision was doubly necessary in these days, when, owing to the operations of the closure, a great many Bills came up to them which had never been discussed at all, or of which, let them say, three-quarters of the clauses had never been debated in the House of Commons. They claimed that right of revision, and they also claimed the right, to be exercised only in extraordinary cases, of asking the country to judge between the two Houses of Parliament as it judged between them at the time of the rejection of the Home Rule Bill, when, they would remember, it pronounced an overwhelming verdict in favour of the House of Lords.

Whatever may be thought of the composition of the House of Lords, of its origin, or of the qualification of its members, it cannot be denied that its conception of its duties as a Second Chamber is sound ;

and experience proves it. Time and again the House of Lords has imposed its temporary veto upon legislation and the country has subsequently endorsed the action of the peers, and, once at least, in 1857, when Lord Palmerston and the Liberal Government went to war with China, and Cobden carried a vote of censure against the Government in the Lower House, the House of Lords, in supporting the Government against its own followers, showed that it accurately interpreted the settled opinion of the electorate.

What would be the opinion of a perfectly impartial person postulating a Second Chamber as necessary in a democratic system of Government and having under review the Second Chamber as it exists with us? I think he would be bound to admit that our Second Chamber forms a sound and accurate estimate of its duties, and that the great majority of its members are by education and experience well qualified to fulfil those duties. I think he would go further and add that it is improbable that a more competent body could be brought together by any system of election or nomination, however theoretically superior such methods of forming a Second Chamber may be. That I believe to be the fact; but in spite of that I am strongly impressed with the necessity for reform. The real force of so-called 'popular' opinion, the volume of which is not, I think, very large, is against any Second Chamber worthy of the name. The real desire is to end the Second Chamber, or, failing that, to reduce it to a condition of paralysed impotence that amounts to the same thing. The necessity for a Second Chamber is recognised in all democratic communities. In none of them is the necessity so urgent as with us. Other nations are confronted with social and economic problems similar to those with which we have to deal; but, in other respects, our position is singular. With a vast Indian Empire to administer, with long and exposed frontiers in the East and West, with great and numerous dominions and possessions in all quarters of the globe whose interests are co-terminous with and, in the nature of things, sometimes conflicting with the interests of other nations, our position is one of extreme sensitiveness. No other nation is exposed to such continual danger. Our legislative and administrative machinery has to deal with problems of a character more varied and more intricate than those which are involved in the affairs of any other people. Any breakdown in our machinery would produce consequences infinitely more serious than in the case of any other community. With us the presence of an efficient governor to prevent the engine racing, of a fly-wheel to ensure steadiness and continuity of impulse, is more essential than to any other nation or Empire. Movement under a single Chamber—under the House of Commons—would be by bounds and rebounds, action and re-action; in short, by jerks. That would be of comparatively small importance were the effect produced confined to our own immediate domestic concerns; but with a world-wide Empire and all the

intricacies and complexities attaching to it involved, it is essential to our existence that the varied and violent modes of motion of the First Chamber should be reduced to one line of consistent progress. A Second Chamber is necessary to our existence. In view of that fact, and of the fact that the outcry against the House of Lords really originates in a desire to reduce it or any other Second Chamber to impotence or to abolish it altogether, it is highly desirable that the House of Lords should take steps to strengthen its position.

The House of Lords is at present labouring under difficulties from which time will bring relief. When the cleavage of political thought is clear, and social or economic opinions have crystallised into concrete political shape, a revising Chamber can form a pretty correct estimate of public feeling from the constitution of the popularly elected House. It can rely upon it that certain lasting definite substantial views dominated an election. Such is not the case now. Party politics are in a state of solution. Elements are seeking the complements necessary for combination. No great distinct issues are at stake. No human being could define the political creed of the party in power; and the party in opposition are concerned mainly in inventing and imposing articles of faith upon the party in power which that party repudiate and deny. This 'sloppy' condition of politics will pass away, party lines will harden up again under new conditions, but in the meantime existing circumstances impose unusual difficulties on the Second Chamber and make it specially incumbent on it to divest itself of elements of weakness and acquire elements of strength.

The most vulnerable spot in the constitution of the House is to be found in the fact that it contains, as any body of such numerical proportions must contain, certain 'undesirables,' and that other members, though perfectly desirable in all other respects, do not take any active interest in political or public affairs; yet both undesirables and absentees can vote, and by their votes might decide some question of the greatest importance. This defect, though probably more apparent than real, should be abated. It would relieve the House of a source of weakness, and the House would undoubtedly derive an element of strength in an extended creation of life peerages, in larger representation of the King's dominions beyond the seas, and in the introduction of representatives of religious bodies other than the Established Church.

But into proposals for reform I do not desire to enter here. My views are embodied in a Bill introduced in the House of Lords in 1888; and Lord Newton has, I am happy to see, expressed his intention of introducing a Bill this session. The pity is that the matter was not officially taken in hand during the long continuance in power of the Unionist party.

Such is the irony of fate that the House of Lords is not unlikely to find itself suffering under the same grievance against which the

House of Commons so clamorously protests, but aggravated to this extent that the latter body has access to a Court of Appeal and the former has not. Nothing can be done save by consent of both Houses. Mending the House of Lords implies of necessity strengthening it. The object of its Radical critics is to weaken or abolish it. Under these circumstances it seems probable that, if the House of Lords passes a wise and moderate measure of reform, the House of Commons will throw out the Bill.

DUNRAVEN.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AS A PRACTICABLE SCHEME

THE Army Order published on the 14th of January shows merely the framework, the skeleton, of the army that is to be. What that skeleton will develop into depends upon the flesh and blood which is to clothe it, and make it a living, fighting, force—an army 'in being.' There is nothing absolutely new in the framework. It groups the various units composing the army into divisions instead of into army corps, on the continental system—a system, as pointed out by the *Times*, 'unsuited to the size of our armies in war and incompatible with the distribution of our troops in peace.' To this extent the new organisation is a great improvement on that which it is to replace. There is, however, one thing that is new in the Army Order. It shows that, in order to mobilise the army, it will be necessary to draw on the auxiliary forces for some 30,000 men to complete the first line, and some 56,000 more to reinforce that line during the first six months of war. This is new. Heretofore the mobilised army scheme contemplated the first line of an expeditionary force being entirely composed of regular troops, auxiliaries being used during war as drafts, to replenish the fighting line, or as units to relieve regular battalions in colonial garrisons, or, as in the case of South Africa, to occupy posts on the lines of communication. Mr. Haldane does not show how he proposes to qualify the auxiliaries for the more important service he would impose upon them. It is unfortunate that we do not follow the example of Switzerland in our official schemes of army reorganisation. When a recent reorganisation was contemplated in Switzerland, it was prepared by the War Department and circulated in full detail to commanding officers and others for report, before being adopted by the Federal Government.

We do not adopt so wise a course. The first complete knowledge the nation gets of any great scheme of army reorganisation is when the War Minister introduces the measure into the House of Commons, which he must thus do without the advantage of a complete knowledge of the views of non-official military experts on the details of his scheme, or whether his proposals will be favourably or unfavourably received by the public. The English people are slaves to precedent,

and the Government, following precedent, will probably announce its completed scheme, and is not likely to make such an important measure non-political, by leaving its followers free to vote as they please. The 'business of the Opposition is to oppose' all Government measures, and the business of the Government is to defend them, from a party point of view, and, as usual, the big battalions will score a success.

Though we cannot know the details of Mr. Haldane's scheme until it is laid before the House as a completed measure, one thing—and that probably the main principle of the scheme—is revealed in the Army Order. It is most desirable that the nation should realise and discuss the main principle of the impending reorganisation before it is finally framed. The Government will thus have the advantage of knowing what the trend of public opinion is, and, if that opinion should be in favour of, what I believe must be, Mr. Haldane's views, it will strengthen his hands with some of his less-informed and more hesitating colleagues, and tend to avert the adoption of compromises, resulting in half measures, which have always been so fatal in army matters.

Mr. Haldane having announced that the first line of his mobilised army, to the extent of one-fifth of its total strength, is to consist of auxiliary troops, it is quite clear that he contemplates a complete revolution in their organisation, for, as they at present exist, they are absolutely and admittedly incapable of such service. In their present state they would not strengthen, they would dilute, the first line to a very dangerous extent. It is the organisation of his second-line army, which, I take it, must involve the main principle of Mr. Haldane's impending reorganisation, and it is to that principle I would draw public attention. A witty American has said 'this country has no climate, it has only samples of weather.' It may with greater truth be said this country has no army, it has only samples of military forces. We have the regulars, with their reserves, admirable in almost every respect except in numbers. In support of these we have the Militia, the Yeomanry, the Volunteers, and some minor organisations. These are all under different conditions of service, on different rates of pay, and on different planes of efficiency, or, may we say, of inefficiency. These regulars and auxiliaries taken in the mass do not constitute an army. They are only 'samples of military forces' that, as at present organised, do not constitute a homogeneous and efficient army, capable of coping, on equal terms, with the great continental armies.

The Adjutant-General, in his evidence before the Royal Commission of 1903, said, speaking of the forces detailed in the annual estimates, 'I think the country has an impression that this paper army is an effective army, but it is not.' To maintain a voluntary regular army sufficient to garrison and defend the Empire—and only a voluntary organisation is desirable, or possible, for such a service—must necessarily

involve enormous expenditure. That expenditure may have reached an amount which demands reduction, provided that an efficient second-line army can be created to supplement the regular forces in times of great emergency.

Before considering how such an efficient second-line army can be obtained, it is as well to justify the statement that our existing auxiliary forces are not qualified for that service. The Royal Commission presided over by the Duke of Norfolk, and largely composed of experienced officers of the auxiliary forces, reported that 'The Militia, in its existing condition, is unfit to take the field for the defence of the country.' And of the Volunteers it reported that 'Neither the musketry nor the tactical training of the rank and file would enable it to face, with prospect of success, the troops of a continental army.' 'The Militia and Volunteer forces have not either the strength or the military efficiency required to enable them to fulfil the functions for which they exist.' Much the same evidence was given before the Royal Commission of 1903. Lord Roberts, in speaking of home defence in the absence of the whole or the greater part of the regular army, said: 'It is impossible to rely upon the Volunteers as now constituted, or upon the Militia.' Lord Wolseley, when Commander-in-Chief, pressed for, and obtained, an increase to the regular army on the ground that the three army corps to be maintained should consist entirely of regulars, the Militia not being capable, as then (and now) constituted, to take their place in the first fighting line.

Look at the condition of the Militia when embodied during the war. When Militia battalions were sent to the Colonies and to South Africa, the question of the minimum age for embarkation arose. The minimum for regulars was twenty. It was proposed to make it nineteen for Militia, but it was found that this would exclude about one-third of the men! The age was reduced to eighteen, which only excluded one-tenth!! There was a deficiency of 303 officers in the sixty-eight battalions selected for service. In one regiment, both battalions of which were employed, there were only eight instead of twenty-four subalterns. In others there were deficiencies ranging from seventeen downwards. In the six months, October 1899 to April 1900, 407 subalterns were appointed to the Militia. 'Most of these went out with no training and knowing nothing,' and 'many without even being gazetted.' The shortage of officers in 1898 was 505, in 1899 624, in 1902 671, and, apparently we are going from bad to worse as, in 1905 it amounted to 964. The defects of the Militia appear still more glaring when the establishment as a whole is examined. In 1905 the establishment authorised was 131,136 of all ranks. At the training only 96,603 could be mustered, a deficiency of 34,533.

Not only do we fail to get the numbers authorised, we fail equally

to get men fairly 'representative of the manhood and intelligence' of the nation. We get instead boys of sixteen or seventeen, who join with a view to transfer to the regulars when they reach the age of eighteen, and we retain many old men in the ranks, disqualified by age and infirmities for field service. If these were excluded the deficiency in 'efficients' of 34,533 would be augmented by many thousands. How can the 'manhood and intelligence' of the nation be induced to enlist in the Militia? Not, I fear, by appeals to its patriotism. That sentiment could not be relied upon as a permanent factor in Militia recruiting. Can the deficiency in numbers be corrected under the existing organisation? Clearly not by offering increased rates of pay. The initial pay is the same in the Militia as in the line, and if we increased it for the Militia we should be obliged to increase it for the regulars, and the expense would become enormous, and the results *nil*. We have had during the past sufficient experience of the folly of increasing the soldier's pay with the hope of attracting a different class of recruits.

That the Militia is so inefficient as to render it unfit, as at present organised, to act as a second-line army capable of serving with the regulars in the first line is, I think, beyond question. In the evidence before the recent Royal Commissions the two great defects of the Militia were repeatedly stated to be the deficiency and inefficiency of officers, and the deficient training of the men, especially as regards musketry. There seems little hope of these defects being corrected. Militia recruits train for sixty-three days on enlistment, fourteen of which are devoted to musketry, and subsequently they train with their battalion for twenty-seven days annually. This training has been proved by results to be insufficient, and yet it will probably be found impossible to extend it, sufficiently to produce satisfactory results, without seriously affecting recruiting. The twenty-seven days' annual training tells severely on the men's civil employment, and is very unpopular with the employers of labour.

The cost of the Militia is so extravagant that to expand it, on the existing scale of expenditure, would be financially unjustifiable. This will be clear by comparing our Militia and its cost with that of Switzerland. The 96,603 of all ranks of Militia trained in 1905 were in no sense an army. They were deficient in staff, in artillery, in cavalry and in medical, store, supply and transport services, and yet they cost about 1,946,280*l*. The Swiss Militia army, numbering 300,000 and completely organised as an efficient army in all arms and services, cost only 1,250,000*l*. The Swiss thus obtained a force three times greater than ours, and incomparably superior in organisation and training, for an expenditure of three-quarters of a million less than ours. Even our Volunteers, in no sense an army, numbering only 256,671, cost 1,668,940*l*. against the 1,250,000*l*. which provides Switzerland with a perfectly organised army of 300,000. Assuming that the Militia and Volunteers,

as at present organised, are incapable of taking their place in the first fighting line, how are we to obtain an efficient second-line army capable of rendering this service? That this can be achieved I have not the shadow of a doubt, and achieved at less cost than for years we have been expending to no purpose. If the nation wishes this end it must wish the means that will produce it. The scheme with which I will conclude this article seems to me to be the only possible way of achieving success, and I hope that it, or something on the same lines, will be found to be the groundwork of Mr. Haldane's scheme of reorganisation.

It is evident that our existing auxiliary forces are incapable of supplying an efficient second-line army to effectively reinforce the first line in the field. Mr. Haldane has, I think, recognised this fact. In his speech of the 12th of July of last year he said of the Militia: 'In time of peace they stay at home, but in time of war they can be of no use to us, unless they form an efficient first-line support to the regular army in the field,' a service which, I have shown, the force, as constituted, is incapable of rendering. In his speech at Newcastle he said: 'The nation in arms is the only safeguard to the public interests. Unless we have an army based on the people, it must, according to modern standards, be a weak army.' He thought 'the time had come to make a beginning and to appeal to the manhood of the nation to render this service.' This accords with the views of the Royal Commission presided over by the Duke of Norfolk. It reported that a home defence army capable,

in the absence of the whole, or the greater part, of the regular forces, of protecting their country against invasion can be raised and maintained only on the principle that it is the duty of every citizen, of military age and sound physique, to be trained for the national defence and to take part in it should emergency arise. It is impossible to rely upon the Volunteers as now constituted or upon the Militia.

The Royal Commission of 1903 reported that

no military system will be satisfactory which does not contain powers of expansion outside the limit of the regular forces of the country, whatever that limit may be.

These are practically the ideas which Lord Roberts has been urging on the nation, with such patriotism, perseverance and eloquence, for the past few years. In his speech at Newcastle in December 1905, after expressing the same opinion as that of the Royal Commission, he said:

It is said by the do-nothing class of persons that the remedy I propose is little short of conscription, and I must, therefore, once again assert, what I have frequently asserted before, that I am always and altogether opposed to conscription as totally inapplicable to an army, the greater part of which must always be serving abroad. Surely there is all the difference in the world between

a nation, every man of which is obliged to serve in the ranks of the regular army, and perform all the onerous duties of a regular soldier, during peace and for small wars, as is the case on the Continent, and the nation which, while maintaining an army for foreign service, asks every man to undergo such a training as will fit him to take a useful part in a great national emergency. . . . By the system I propose no actual service would be demanded of anyone except for home defence in the event of a great national emergency. But every able-bodied man, whatever his birth, position, or wealth, high or low, rich or poor, would be obliged to acquire a knowledge of military duties sufficient to fit him to take his part in the defence of the country. All the time demanded would be devoted to training, and no man would be taken from civil life in peace, to garrison our fortresses, or perform any of the services that fall to the lot of the regular army, or to conscript armies of continental nations. . . . In our endeavour to get the principle accepted we shall, no doubt, meet with the usual arguments urged by that section of the public who are content to believe that, as we have muddled through critical periods in our past history, we may hope to be as fortunate in the future. Let me implore you, as a soldier of more than fifty years' service, who knows what war was, and what it is now, not to be led away by such dangerous beliefs. The days of muddling through a war to a satisfactory conclusion, by dint of a dogged perseverance and physical courage alone, on the part of our troops, are over. You do not neglect the insurance of your business premises on the chance that 'fortune will favour the brave,' and it is as an insurance against risk to this great Empire, and to your native land, that I would ask you to help me in extending the principle of universal training.

Lord Roberts's eloquent appeal has met with marked success throughout the nation. Lord Rosebery in Edinburgh on the 8th of December said:

I do not think all realise, as they should realise, that they owe, as a great duty to the country, the duty of taking up arms, if necessary, in its defence. I know it is held that this is not a democratic view, that it savours of militarism, and that militarism is a feudal, exploded, aristocratic idea which should not find refuge in any manly bosom. The exact reverse of that is the case. There is no more democratic idea than the idea that every man owes a military duty to his country. In England the armed force of the country primarily consists of every able-bodied man within its limits. That is the old unwritten law of the constitution of England.

Lord Milner recently stated that he was

an out-and-out believer in the doctrine that a great nation should rely for its protection upon its whole manhood, and not upon a limited professional class.

He accepted unreservedly the doctrine that

it is the duty of everyone to take part in the service of his country, and to be so trained that he could do so effectively. . . . I believe in universal military training. I have been an accomplice of Lord Roberts in his attempt to persuade his countrymen not to rely entirely upon paying a small portion of their number to fight for the rest, but to establish our national security upon a broader basis, and one—if I may say it without offence—more compatible with self-respect. I agree with all Mr. Haldane and Lord Rosebery have recently said, and said much better than I can, about a nation in arms, and the duty of every man to be ready to defend his country. But I go one step further than they do. I cannot for the life of me see, if this really is the duty of every man, and a duty

of supreme importance to the State, why the performance of that duty should be left quite optional, while the discharge of many minor duties is not so left. Either this great second line of defence, this national reservoir of men, is a vital public necessity or it is not. . . . If it is, how extraordinary to leave it to chance, to individual preference, or convenience, to decide whether you get it or not. . . . But above all have one period of military training for men of all classes on the threshold of manhood, which should be regarded as part of the education of the citizen, and would give you material alike for the small professional army, which would still be voluntarily recruited, and for that great national reserve, however organised, on the necessity of which every expert, as far as I know, is agreed.

Mr. Stead says :

When a nation shall have reached the point where every citizen feels it his duty and privilege to be trained in arms for the defence of the Fatherland, and is educated to understand the real significance of this service, it will become a greater, saner, and more efficient people.

The Social Democratic Federation recently issued a pamphlet, written by the well-known Mr. H. Quelch, entitled 'Social Democracy and the Armed Nation.' While strongly opposed to militarism, it states :

What we advocate is not compulsory military service, but a compulsory and universal military training. That is a totally different matter. Conscription is an evil. It involves the withdrawal of men from civil life, keeping them herded together in barracks, establishing them as a caste apart, as soldiers, as distinct from civilians or citizens. Conscription means a standing army of men decivilised, removed from citizenship, in antagonism to the great body of people, the citizens ; the compulsory military training which we advocate carries with it the avoidance of all these evils. It means that every citizen shall be trained to act as a soldier at need, but that no one shall become merely a soldier, or cease to be a citizen. Thus, by training every man to the use of arms from his youth up, we should have—without the waste, the expense, the vice and demoralisation of the barracks—the armed nation, the real army of the democracy

The German democracy shares this view. Herr Bebel, its leader, says : 'Home defence is a duty for all who are capable of that duty.'

Sir George Hayter Chubb says :

No one who combines an acquaintance with commerce and with naval and military service can come to any other conclusion but that it would be the best thing for the country that there should be some form of universal military service.

Colonel Sir John E. Bingham says :

Twelve months' training for young workmen and others, say between seventeen and nineteen years of age, when they would be most easily moulded, and spared from their work, would be to their physical and disciplinary advantage. I have found volunteering leave them all the better workmen, writing as I do, authoritatively, from my military knowledge and as a large employer of labour.

The President of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce stated :

I am quite sure that if it were enacted that young men between nineteen and twenty-one, or some similar age, were to spend a year of their lives with the regulars they would come back to us much better men . . . and they would get better wages when they returned to us than they did when they left us. I am sure that without this insurance for our country we shall be in a state of decadence before long ; and as an employer of labour I would support it most enthusiastically. Whatever system sends workpeople to universal military training, it will make them better citizens and better workpeople than they will otherwise be without it.

The military correspondent of the *Times*, a recognised authority on military questions, says :

The doctrine that every man is bound to be ready to defend the Empire, whenever attacked, is one that we not only can, but must, support with all its consequences and with enthusiasm, as every nation in Europe worth its salt has done, if facts disclose that voluntary patriotism no longer responds to our needs.

The *Times* endorses this view :

Our military correspondent, who has hitherto been a constant advocate of the voluntary principle, confesses frankly that, at the present rate, the defenders of that principle will soon be driven to their last ditch, and that the nation, which really does care about national security, will rally round men like Lord Roberts and Lord Milner who know what they want, and have a definite solution which will provide the force we require, and who appeal to a great moral and political principle.

At first the public seemed to fear that this enforced national training would give rise to undue militarism. That fear has now greatly diminished, if it has not yet been completely dispelled. The pamphlet of the Social Democratic Federation already quoted states :

It is safe to say that there is an infinitely stronger peace party in countries where military service is compulsory than in this country with its voluntary system. . . . The more the evil consequences of war are brought home to the people in their everyday life, the more will they desire that it should be avoided. Every man would be liable . . . and the majority would certainly be in favour of peace and against war.

Lord Milner said 'the development of qualities of discipline, order, method and the sense of public duty was a question we had to face,' and expressed his firm conviction that

a people prepared to undergo trouble and face danger, by personal service, would outstrip, not only in war but in peace, the efforts of nations who refused to make a similar sacrifice for their country's good. People think that it will make us more prone to go to war. Personally, I hold exactly the opposite opinion. Professional soldiers may sometimes wish for war, and an unmilitary mob does often clamour for it, from an unhealthy love of excitement as for some gladiatorial show. They would feel very differently if they had themselves to be the gladiators. . . . In a democratic State having a national militia the men who decide upon a war are the men who, or whose children, have got to wage it.

They will think twice before they take the plunge, but other nations will also think twice before they quarrel with them.

Lord Roberts, in the speech I have already quoted, said:

It has, I know, frequently been urged that universal military training would lead to militarism and to war. Would that I could convince the haters of militarism, and lovers of peace, how truly the contrary is the case. There is no surer guarantee of peace than to be prepared for war. If every able-bodied man in our island is prepared to play the part of the strong man armed, his own and his country's goods will remain at peace.

I think I have laboured this aspect of the case sufficiently, at any rate as far as respect for space will justify me in doing.

Lord Roberts has said:

If once the principle be adopted by the nation that it is the duty of every man to fit himself for the defence of the country in the event of a great emergency, a scheme for carrying it into effect would not, I believe, be difficult to formulate.

I would have preferred to leave the formulation of an organisation, which would give shape and effect to the views of the authorities I have quoted, in other and more capable hands than mine; but as I am not aware that any scheme of organisation has been formulated, I feel that I may, after fifty years' touch with army questions, venture, without undue presumption, to lay before the public a scheme which I have long thought to be the only practicable one. If the nation decides that part of the education of its young men shall consist of sufficient military training to qualify them to take part in the defence of their country, the establishment of the necessary military schools of instruction throughout the country will be a much more simple matter than might be supposed. The schools must always be open and ready at all times to receive pupils. An effective machinery for this is ready to our hands. We have in this country the headquarters and staff of 124 Militia battalions. These are only assembled for duty on twenty-seven days in the year when the Militia undergo their, deficient, annual training. These Militia battalions form part of regiments of the regular army, though the connexion between the regulars and the Militia battalions has been much less intimate than Lord Cardwell contemplated, and very much less than it should be.

My proposal is that the staff of the Militia battalions should be permanently embodied, that they should become the dépôt battalions of the line regiments; the lieutenant-colonel commanding, the adjutant, and perhaps one or two other officers, should be drawn from the battalions of regulars. This measure will have the incidental advantage of remedying the draft difficulty when both regular battalions are abroad, of which we have heard so much of late years. It should be the duty of the dépôt battalion to train the recruits for the line

battalions, and to give the youths of the country their military training and knowledge. This training should be for one year. or for such other period as might be sufficient. At the expiration of that training the youths would have three courses open to them. Those who wished to enter the army might enlist, those who preferred to return to civil life could do so, but would be required to be inscribed, for from three to five years, in the reserve of their battalions, or they might, for a small retaining fee, be enrolled in the reserve of the regular battalions. During those three or five years they would be required to undergo a certain number of days' training so as to keep alive their military knowledge. That training should be given by their battalion at any time most convenient to them, and that would interfere least with their civil occupations. Or they might join Volunteer corps and thus keep alive their efficiency. By this system we should in five years possess dépôt battalions that could, in case of emergency, call up their reserve and become efficient auxiliaries to the service battalions. Their service would be confined to the United Kingdom, unless they volunteered for active service abroad, either in units or as drafts from the reserve of trained men, which in five years would number over 200,000 fully trained and of the best fighting age. When the regular army is in the field it is mainly drafts and not complete units that are required to reinforce it. When the Duke of Wellington was offered Militia battalions in 1813 he replied that he would prefer drafts to complete the strength of the regiments under his command, rather than fresh units. It has been suggested that the second-line army should be made liable to serve abroad, at the will of the authorities. I agree with the military correspondent of the *Times* on this question. He says :

> It is true by refusing to impose the liability to serve abroad upon the second-line army, we incur certain risk, and harass the souls of strategists who wish to calculate upon definite numbers with a desirable certainty, but we have always been in that position in regard to the Militia, and it has never failed us yet. There is nothing whatever to suggest that the second-line army of the future will be less patriotic.

Those to be trained would consist of all youths between certain ages, say from seventeen to twenty, or whatever ages might be found most suitable and convenient to the public. The exemptions would, no doubt, be those usual in conscript armies, namely, men serving in the army, in the navy, the marines, and the mercantile marine, all physically unfit for military service, clergy, bread-winners and only sons of widows, &c. If the whole of the 124 Militia battalions were retained as training battalions, which probably would not be necessary, they could, if each trained 600 youths, send annually to the reserve some 74,000 trained reservists. Thus in a very few years we should replace our present inefficient Militia battalions by others composed of the 'manhood and intelligence' of the nation trained

for its defence in times of emergency. And in a comparatively short period of time, in the life of a nation, we should become a 'nation trained to arms.' Those under training would have to be fed, clothed and housed at the public expense, and presumably there would be some small allowance as pocket-money, though not as pay. Apart from the Militia battalions forming the dépôts of line regiments, it might be desirable to retain a certain number of battalions as schools for what are known abroad as one-year volunteers. With all it might be desirable that residence in barracks should be optional, just as there are boarders and day scholars in schools. This, unless it were found to interfere with discipline, would smooth the working of the schools and obviate one of the great difficulties incidental to universal training. That training would be enormously facilitated if Lord Roberts's further recommendation were carried out.

> 'In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of efficiency being reached in the short time men could reasonably be expected to undergo military training, [he recommends that] universal physical training of a military character and instruction in the use of the rifle should form part of the curriculum of all schools and, in the case of boys who leave school before eighteen, the continuation of this training up to that age in cadet corps, boys' brigades, and similar institutions under State supervision.

He also recommends 'the encouragement of rifle clubs and the endeavour to make rifle shooting a national sport.' He truly 'considers that this course would be of inestimable benefit to the boys, physically and morally, in whatever civil calling they may be employed,' while it would reduce the period necessary for battalion training and render that training much more effective. The great difficulty to solve is that of the supply of officers. Lord Roberts says :

> One point seems to me absolutely essential, and that is that the conditions should be such that the youths of the educated classes, having gone through their preliminary training, should be stimulated to pass the examination necessary to qualify them to undertake the duties appertaining to officers' rank. It is in this way alone we can hope to get a sufficient supply of officers to meet our requirements.

This end might be promoted by giving commissions in the training battalions and by offering a certain number of commissions in the regular army to those who trained for it, the commissions to be assigned to those who are successful in a competitive qualifying examination.

The Volunteers

It would not do to include service in Volunteer corps among the exceptions from compulsory training. To do so would induce many to join Volunteer corps in order to avoid their year's training with the

dépôt battalions. The result would be that their training would be less efficient. On the completion of their training, however, they should be encouraged to join the Volunteers. This would be an advantage to them, as it would keep alive their knowledge, and a great advantage to the Volunteers, as they would obtain a trained, instead of an untrained, recruit. I do not deal with the organisation of the Volunteers, nor with the training of Militia artillery and engineers. The same machinery is available for these arms as for the infantry. The training of cavalry and of men for supply, transport, medical and other departmental services will offer more difficulty. To elaborate these points would be impossible in the space available in these pages. Nor is it necessary to do so, until the principle of universal training has been accepted.

This article only purports to describe the principle on which a second-line army should be based. It does not pretend to be a completed scheme. To elaborate it into a completed scheme, if the principle were accepted, could only be accomplished by experts possessed of complete official records and information. Whether the country is yet ripe for its adoption, or whether the Government will have the courage to propose either this or some other system of universal military training, remains to be seen. Its vast importance cannot be overrated. In spite of the 'blue water school' it is now admitted that raids on this country, in considerable force, are well within the bounds of possibility. Should they occur when the country was denuded of its regular army, what would be its fate if it had to rely upon its existing auxiliary forces for defence? Lord Salisbury has told us. Speaking at the Albert Hall in 1900, while urging 'the necessity of precaution in time,' he said:

> Remember what has happened to the great maritime powers of the past. . . . In every case the great maritime power has been paralysed and killed, not by disasters it may have suffered in its provinces, or its outlying dependencies, in every case it has succumbed to a blow directed at the heart. This is a lesson which a power like Great Britain ought not to neglect. So long as our heart was unstruck, we might look with comparative indifference on the result of any war. . . . But if our heart is once struck, there is an end to the history of England.

That emphatic warning produced marked effect. The nation now realises 'the necessity for precaution in time.' The few utterances I have quoted represent a great mass of opinion from all sorts and conditions of men, and from all classes of the nation. They unite in urging universal military training as the one essential 'precaution in time' that will give security to the country. Mr. Haldane evidently shared this view when he said, 'The nation in arms is the only safeguard to the public interests.' That expression presumably meant the nation trained to the use of arms. Does anyone suppose that we can train the whole nation to arms without making that training part of the compulsory education of the people? Even if

we tried, by high pay, to bribe the nation into universal voluntary training, we should fail, and the cost of our failure would be enormous. If Mr. Haldane still adheres to his patriotic view, it is most important that his hands should be strengthened by unmistakable public support. Do his colleagues share his views? There has been an ominous silence on their part. Are there party reasons, or Cabinet differences, unknown to the public which would explain that silence? If they exist they may induce the Government 'rather to bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of,' and to seek refuge in some compromise that will 'keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it to our hope.'

HALIBURTON.

P.S.—The fear that Mr. Haldane might be unable to base his Army Reform on his axiom, that 'the Nation in Arms is the only safeguard to the public interests' has, alas, proved well founded. His intention to 'appeal to the manhood of the nation to render this service,' remains unfulfilled. His statement last night, in the House, makes no such provision, and no such appeal. The 'Local Associations' may improve the personnel of the Militia and Volunteers, but they will not give us a 'Nation in Arms.' The Royal Commissions condemned the Militia and Volunteers because of the insufficiency and inefficiency of the officers, and the deficient training of the men. Their annual training in the future will apparently, in the case of the Militia, be less than in the past. The main difference between my scheme and that of the Government is, that I would draw closer the Cardwell tie between the Regulars and the Militia, making them the Depôt battalions of the Regulars, and assigning to them the duty of training the youth of the nation, so that in a few years we should have the manhood of 'the Nation in Arms.' Mr. Haldane disestablishes the Militia and completely divorces it from the Regular Army, transferring it and the Volunteers to the administrative control of the 'Local Associations.' He creates, in place of the Militia, new depôt battalions of Regulars to enlist and train 'non-regular reservists' for the Army. A valuable and essential measure, if universal military training cannot be achieved, but one that will never give us 'the Nation in Arms, the only safeguard to the public interests.'

HALIBURTON.

26th of February, 1907.

THE BRITISH FLEET AND THE BALANCE OF SEA POWER

On the eve of the presentation of the Navy Estimates to Parliament, a number of official announcements with reference to the fleet have been published which reveal in detail the plans of the Board of Admiralty for maintaining the supremacy of the British Navy in the coming financial year. At the same time it has been notified that Admiral Lord Charles Beresford has accepted the position of Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet, and in virtue of this appointment and his seniority he will become practically the British 'admiralissimo,' responsible for the defence of home waters in case of war. This intelligence is of special importance because a redistribution of naval forces in the 'Narrow Seas' is about to take place. It is true that an unveracious story was circulated to the effect that this officer had refused the charge before sailing for the United States, but a swift denial from the Admiralty, as well as from Lord Charles himself, dispelled all doubt. In these circumstances, and in view of the 'negotiations' with this officer which it is admitted preceded his acceptance of his new appointment, an effort may be made to explain exactly what is proposed.

During the month which has just closed sixty battleships and cruisers which constitute the Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean fleets of the British Navy, have been assembled off the Portuguese coast, carrying out, in accordance with what has now become a regular routine, combined tactical exercises under the supreme command of Admiral Sir Arthur Wilson, the senior British admiral at present flying his flag afloat, in association with eight other flag officers.[1] Now that these manœuvres are over, a complete redistribution of men-of-war in British waters will take place, and Lord Charles

[1] In March 1902 Lord Charles Beresford, who has done so much to promote naval efficiency, pointed out that 'strategical manœuvres are totally distinct from tactical manœuvres; the yearly manœuvres have been strategical manœuvres. Tactical manœuvres are manœuvres in which one fleet is handled against another fleet, with the object of each trying to get the position of advantage. . . . No captain in the Navy has ever tactically handled a squadron of battleships against another, and only three of our admirals.' Such tactical manœuvres are now of frequent occurrence.

Beresford will shift his flag from the Mediterranean to the Channel Fleet in succession to Sir Arthur Wilson, on the latter's deeply regretted retirement through the operation of the age clause.

It is two years since a 'general post' in the Navy was ordered, and in the interval political changes have occurred which cannot fail to have affected the strategical plans of the British naval authorities. The new scheme of distribution, now that official details are available, indicates very clearly a further shifting of naval power from southern to northern European waters, where an unparalleled concentration will be effected. In place of eight battleships in the Mediterranean, based upon Malta, it is intended to maintain six only, which will all be of the *Formidable* class; the existing Atlantic fleet of eight battleships, with Gibraltar as its base, is being replaced by six battleships, and these will make Berehaven, on the south-west coast of Ireland, their headquarters; while the Channel fleet will consist of fourteen very powerful battleships instead of fifteen less powerful ones, as at present. With each of these three battle-fleets will be associated a squadron of four armoured cruisers, making twelve of these vessels altogether or thirty-eight armoured men-of-war in all in these three fleets, as well as many protected cruisers.

The principal and most significant change in connexion with this redistribution, it may be stated in summary, is the movement of the eight powerful battleships of the *King Edward the Seventh* class, each of 16,350 tons displacement—ships of unrivalled strength in comparison with vessels of foreign fleets—from the Atlantic (Gibraltar) to the North Sea and English Channel, with Portland as their base, there replacing nine smaller ships of much inferior fighting qualities, and the removal of the Atlantic fleet to Berehaven from Gibraltar. The result will be greater concentration in British waters.

These alterations in existing fleets synchronise with the creation of a new naval force, the Home fleet—which will cruise in the North Sea, where hitherto British naval power has never been permanently represented. Instructions have already been given with reference to the constitution of this additional striking arm, which will be the 'Home guard.' It is to differ from the ordinary seagoing forces in that it will be divided into three divisions of varying preparedness for war, based respectively on the Nore, Portsmouth, and Devonport. It is intended to apply to these three divisions a 'sliding scale' in respect to the size of the crews; the top of the scale will be at the Nore. The battleship *Dreadnought* is to be the flagship of the Commander-in-Chief, with the Nore as its headquarters, and from the fact that this unique vessel will have on board a full complement of officers and men, it might have been assumed that all the ships of the Home fleet stationed at the Nore—twelve armoured vessels in all—would have practically full complements of officers and men if Lord Tweedmouth had not made the definite statement in the House of

Lords, while the vessels at Portsmouth and Devonport will apparently be allotted crews somewhat smaller; Lord Tweedmouth has stated that they will be about three-fifths of the war complements.

It is reasonable to suppose that the complements of officers and men will be so adjusted as to keep in a condition of readiness for action at the two Channel ports those men-of-war which would be first required in case of sudden outbreak of hostilities. That the crews even in the Portsmouth and Devonport divisions will not be mere 'maintenance parties' may be judged, apart from Lord Tweedmouth's specific statements in the House of Lords on the 18th of February, from the Admiralty's declaration that all these ships, as well as those of the Nore division, will be required to proceed to sea for frequent cruises, and that they will carry out 'battle practice' and other drills in accordance with ordinary sea routine. The Home fleet is the development of the system of Reserve Divisions instituted two years ago. These ships have not been in the habit of doing 'battle practice,' and the change indicates that all the necessary gunnery ratings will be assigned in future to the men-of-war in the Home fleet.

Under the existing organisation of the ships which are kept permanently in the Home waters,—the Reserve Divisions—the Admiralty have in the past two years maintained at each of the three ports two battleships and two armoured cruisers which have been specified in the *Navy List* as 'emergency' ships. This is in accordance with the plans drawn up two years since when the reserves were completely reorganised and every efficient fighting vessel was provided with a nucleus crew consisting of two-fifths of the full complement. The Admiralty then announced that, 'in addition to the ships of the Reserve Divisions with two-fifths of their normal complement, there will be a sufficient margin of ratings kept at home to enable the Board to commission an "emergency squadron" without dislocating the schools or nucleus crews, or having recourse to a general mobilisation.' The Nore division of the Home fleet is merely a development of this 'emergency' scheme which was outlined in the Admiralty memorandum of Christmas 1904. Instead of keeping two battleships and two armoured cruisers at each of the three ports in readiness to respond to an emergency call, it is intended to place these twelve armoured ships under the eye of the commander-in-chief of the Home fleet at the Nore. With the *Dreadnought*, which is to retain her full crew when she returns from her West Indian experimental cruise, will be associated these armoured ships (manned practically to war strength) which have been distributed hitherto between Chatham, Portsmouth and Devonport. Thus Vice-Admiral F. C. B. Bridgeman, the Commander-in-Chief of the whole Home fleet, will be provided with a battle division at the Nore of six battleships with its own commanding officer and half a dozen of the most powerful armoured cruisers, which will form the Fifth Cruiser Squadron, and will also be under a rear-

admiral. The absurdity of assuming that it has ever been intended to relegate the *Dreadnought* to the Nore as flagship, with a full crew, and link with this vessel of unique qualities a museum of old ships less than half manned, does not need to be seriously controverted. The bare idea of such a parody of a war organisation would be an injustice to a Chinese mandarin.

Admiralty orders have already indicated that the Nore division of the Home fleet will have a large number of torpedo-boat destroyers. Two years since we possessed three flotillas of eight destroyers each in British waters—twenty-four in all. Until a few weeks ago there were three flotillas of twelve destroyers each, and now it is intended to create an additional flotilla, bringing up the number of destroyers in full commission to forty-eight. In the past one flotilla has been based upon Devonport and another upon Portsmouth, but in future all the flotillas in full commission will cruise at the eastern end of the Channel and in the North Sea for most of the year, and instead of their training being of a more or less haphazard character it will be controlled and systematised by Captain Lewis Bailey, who has been appointed as Commodore of the second class for the specific purpose of superintending the training of these mosquito craft. This new Commodore will be responsible to Rear-Admiral R. A. J. Montgomerie, who, under the new scheme, is in control of all torpedo craft in home waters, subject to the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the Home Fleet. In addition to the four active flotillas and about twenty torpedo boats upwards of seventy destroyers and many torpedo boats will be maintained with large nucleus crews at the home ports, and will make frequent cruises.

Consequently, as a result of this latest reorganisation of ships of the fleets, the war training of the Navy will be placed upon a higher level and the ships will be disposed in a manner more in accordance with the present international situation. In place of the twelve battleships which patrolled the English Channel and the North Sea two years ago, we shall obtain a far more powerful Channel fleet of fourteen battleships, a 'Home guard,' based at the Nore, of six battleships, and the Atlantic fleet, making its headquarters at Berehaven, consisting of six battleships—or twenty-six battleships in all in 'British waters,' more than twice as many as in 1905. Associated with these battle fleets will be fourteen armoured cruisers and forty-eight destroyers. As a second line there will be the battleships, cruisers, and torpedo craft of the other divisions of the Home fleet at Portsmouth and Devonport, and finally there will be a section of 'special service vessels,' comprising six battleships of the *Royal Sovereign* type, the *Trafalgar* and *Renown*, all of them vessels which are now obsolescent, but which would serve a useful purpose in case of war. These veterans of the Navy have small crews allotted to them in order that they may be kept

ready to be brought forward in case of need. This is the organisation which has been described as 'cutting down the Navy by 25 per cent.,' and it is for this act of statesmanlike naval development that the Admiralty have been held up by the Navy League to the reproach of the British people, and it has been suggested that the Sea Lords should be hanged at their own yard-arms. Under the new scheme every warship, of whatever type, which might be required in war is provided with a crew and is kept in a condition of efficiency exactly in proportion to its usefulness for the defence of the Empire.

It is sometimes profitable to glance back in order to calculate what progress has been made, and if those who regard the efforts of the present Board of Admiralty without feelings of gratitude would throw their recollection back five years to the condition of the British fleet as it then existed the voice of criticism would be entirely silenced. In 1902 the organisation of the fleet had been considerably improved, and the responsible authorities were beginning to appreciate the wisdom of Captain Mahan's dictum that warfare depends for efficient control and efficient energy on the operations of concentrated bodies. 'The essential characteristics of these masses,' this American author pointed out, 'are force, which is gained by concentration of numbers, and mobility, which is the ability to carry the force rapidly as well as effectively from the centre to any point of the outlying field where action, offensive or defensive, becomes necessary.' Five years ago the naval authorities were groping after an organisation which would meet the needs of the Empire. The present writer made an effort to review the organisation of the Navy in a volume which was published exactly five years ago and was entitled *Naval Efficiency—The War Readiness of the Fleet.* At that time the distribution of naval force provided for twelve battleships in the Mediterranean, seven in the Channel Squadron, and ten in the Reserve Squadron. The Reserve Squadron, which went for a short cruise every quarter only, had then been recently formed out of the less than half-manned ships which hitherto had been dotted round the coastline, doing coast and port-guard duties; 'they went to sea only once a year, were inadequately manned, and in every respect unfitted for active service.'

Summarising the position of the fleets in the 'Narrow Seas,' it was pointed out that

> In the Mediterranean are five different types of battleships, even if the *Hood* is included in the *Royal Sovereign* class; there are three of the *Majestic* class, one of the *Canopus*, three of the *Royal Sovereign*, four of the *Formidable*, including the *Irresistible*, which has just been commissioned, and one *Renown*. In the Channel Squadron we have some approach towards a model force, since it includes six *Majestics* and only one of the *Royal Sovereign*; it is too weak, weaker by one unit than it was a few months ago, but that is another matter. The Reserve Squadron, the real 'Home Guard,' is a most extraordinary collection of heterogeneous units of various designs, armaments, and speeds—a crowd of nondescript ships.

Even at this date the organisation of the fleet, though it marked a great advance on that of a few years before, was far from reaching perfection, and the same remark applied at that time to the Reserves, resting at the home ports—unmanned. The only ships in full sea-going commission with crews living on board in British waters were those constituting the Channel Fleet, then our only battle force nearer than Malta.

Not only were these unmanned reserves unfit in all respects for war, but the less than half-manned Reserve Squadron went to sea very infrequently. The latter organisation was at last realised by the Admiralty to be a delusion and a snare. In presenting the Navy Estimates for 1903 Earl Selborne announced a new organisation and the creation of a Home Fleet. He stated :

> The Fleet in home waters has been reorganised and placed under the orders of a vice-admiral in command, with a rear-admiral as second-in-command. His duties and responsibilities in respect of home waters are analogous to those of the Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean, except that they will in no way overlap or impinge upon the authority of the Commanders-in-Chief of the three home ports within their respective commands.
>
> The Home Fleet is quite independent of the Channel Squadron; it has as its nucleus of battleships the Home Squadron, consisting of the former port guardships which have been withdrawn from this service, and it has its head-quarters at Portland. This squadron, in combination with coastguard battle-ships and cruisers, composes the Home Fleet, which assembles three times in each year for joint exercises.
>
> Under the order, also, when required, of the admiral commanding the Home Fleet will be the several destroyer flotillas along the coast, which are now organised each under its own captain and commander, with a stationary parent ship, and supervised by an inspecting captain of destroyers, who is responsible for the general organisation of the whole. Sheerness Dockyard will be specially organised to undertake large refits and repair work for destroyers and torpedo-boats.

Thus was formed the former Home Fleet, which two years ago became the Channel Squadron ; the old Channel Squadron, under the name of the Atlantic Fleet, was moved to Gibraltar and became the pivot force of the fleet in the ' Near Seas,' handy as a reinforcement in the English Channel or the Mediterranean. The probability of reinforcements being required in the Mediterranean, owing to the *entente cordiale*, has quite disappeared, and the Atlantic Fleet is now to be brought to an Irish base, and out of the ships in the Reserve Divisions a new Home Fleet is to be formed with its active ' nucleus ' at the Nore, and with this force, in accordance with the precedent of 1903, all torpedo craft in home waters will be associated, with the proviso that for the study of war problems one or more flotillas and the Fifth Cruiser Squadron (Nore cruiser division of the Home Fleet) may be lent by the Admiralty to the Commander-in-Chief of either the Channel or Atlantic Fleet. At the same time Sheerness Dockyard

becomes the repairing base of the destroyer flotillas, as intended by Lord Selborne four years ago.

In view of the creation of this new Home Fleet, comprising, as has been indicated, three divisions at the Nore, Portsmouth, and Devonport, provided with crews in proportion to the urgency with which they will be required in time of war, it may be recalled that two years ago, and in fact until Christmas 1904, the reserve ships at the chief naval ports were without crews on board and thus divided :—

Fleet Reserve.—'A' Division included all ships which could be ready for sea in forty-eight hours. These vessels had on board all projectiles and torpedoes above the six-pounders, and it had recently been decided to embark also the machine and small-arm ammunition and part of the explosives.

'B' Division included all ships which could be ready for sea in thirty days. In most respects these vessels were in as forward a state in respect to ammunition, stores, and coal as those comprised in the 'A' Division, but usually had repairs of a minor character requiring attention. As soon as the dockyard workmen were withdrawn they passed into the 'A' Division.

'C' Division included all ships which required more extensive repairs, but were not of such a character as to occupy a very long period.

Dockyard Reserve.—'D' Division included ships that required a thorough overhaul before they could be permitted to go to sea again.

'E' Division included vessels that were not likely to be again required as effective fighting ships.

This reserve system, though none of the vessels had crews on board or any war organisation, marked a considerable improvement upon that which had existed only a year or two before. It was ineffective in that it resulted in a complete divorce between *matériel* and *personnel*, and on the occasion even of the annual manœuvres led to the fleet reserve ships proceeding to sea under officers and men entirely strange to their mechanical equipment, with natural results.

In the past two years remarkable improvements have been made, and it is only right that the nation should realise the work which has been accomplished with an accompanying reduction in expenditure. To-day, in place of the Reserve system already described, we are to possess a Home Fleet, the Nore Division of which will consist exclusively of new and most powerful ships, and will be as efficient in war training as the Channel Squadron of five years ago; while the divisions at Devonport and Portsmouth will be a very great improvement upon even the Reserve Squadron as it existed in 1902, and will closely resemble indeed the Home Fleet of the past, but will include better ships, and will cruise more frequently.

Under the new scheme the reserve ships which two years ago were without an officer or man on board, and have since formed the Reserve Divisions, become an integral part of 'the fighting line' instead of being laid up, month in and month out, as in 1904, in the Dockyards. Consequently by the new plans of the Admiralty we

obtain the following armoured ships in commission in British waters :—

Fleet	Battleships	Armoured Cruisers
Channel	14	4
Atlantic	6	4
Home (Nore Division)	6	6
Home (Portsmouth and Devonport Divisions with three-fifths nucleus crews)	12	12
	38	26
Total of armoured ships in British waters in commission in 1907	64	
Ditto in 1903	20	
Ditto in 1902	19	

In addition, there will be this year ten armoured ships in the Mediterranean (including six battleships), four in the Fourth Cruiser Squadron, which cruises in the West Indies, and four in China waters.

It is not unnatural, particularly in view of the desire of a section of the political party now in power to press an economical policy to dangerous lengths, that the British people, who realise the vital importance of sea power, should inquire whether this provision for the defence of British interests is adequate. For fifteen years it has been an axiom that the British fleet must be maintained at a Two-Power standard. This principle has been applied to the shipbuilding programme and woe betide the Government which endeavours to whittle down this essential plank in the national programme.[2]

The same rough-and-ready method of calculation may be applied to the provision which is made from time to time for the maintenance of the fleets at sea. The best method, therefore, to judge of the adequacy of the arrangements which have been made by the Admiralty in the new scheme of redistribution is to compare the strength of the British fleets and squadrons with those which will be maintained simultaneously by rival Powers.

For the purposes of a comparison of this character we may eliminate the fleet of Japan, which is our ally. It would be the height of madness to reduce our naval preparations in European waters in virtue of this defensive agreement, and it is much safer and more statesmanlike, in making any comparative analysis of naval strength at sea, to ignore entirely the sea forces which Japan will maintain during the coming year. It is sufficient for the present purpose to state that the Eastern fleet flying the White Ensign comprises four modern armoured cruisers

[2] Eliminating all battleships over twenty years of age, and taking into account all battleships which were building on the 1st of November last, the position, according to the U.S. Naval Intelligence Department, in battleships of 10,000 tons or more completed, will be as follows in 1909 :—

	Number	Displacement	
Great Britain	56	785,600	49 battleships of 603,811 tons, which represents the strength of the combined fleets of France and Germany.
Germany	24	286,650	
France	25	317,161	
United States	27	366,146	

and about a dozen protected cruisers. This force is quite adequate to the necessities of the hour, particularly as the ships of Japan in case of war would co-operate with the British admirals in Eastern waters.

There remain six great national fleets, whose strength in armoured ships in commission must be considered in contrast with the naval forces which the British Admiralty have announced their intention to maintain, if we would judge the adequacy of the British naval preparations. These six Sea-Powers may be considered *seriatim*.

Russia

What remains of the Russian Navy is in a state of suspended animation. Apart from the fleet immured in the Black Sea, Russia possesses only two modern battleships, the *Slava* and *Czarevitch*, now cruising at large. In the Black Sea, Russia maintains at present two first-class battleships and three obsolescent vessels. Owing to the revolutionary movement and the lack of confidence placed in the crews, the ships are not provided with ammunition and the guns have no breech-blocks. The Russian fleet is a *quantité négligeable*.

Austria-Hungary

The fleet of Austria-Hungary ranks as only second class, but in conceivable circumstances it might prove, small as it is, a factor of minor importance. In any case it may disarm criticism if attention is drawn in passing to the fleet which it is intended to maintain during the present year. The figures are as follows :—

In Commission	Battleships, 1st class	3
	„ 2nd „	1
	Armoured cruisers	2
In Reserve (with nucleus crews)	Battleships, 3rd class	3
	Armoured cruiser	1

Italy

Owing to financial circumstances, the Italian naval authorities have had to evolve a peculiar organisation which is essentially economical. During the present year the organisation will be as follows :

In 'Armamento' (full commission) for seven months and for five months in 'Armamento Ridotto' (having reduced seagoing complements on board, but in other respects being practically ready for sea)	Battleships	8
In 'Armamento' for seven months and in 'Armamento Ridotto' for five months	Armoured Cruisers	5
In 'Armamento Ridotto' for six months and for six months in 'Riserva' (having about 55 per cent. of full complement on board, including captain, second in command, and heads of departments, and ready for sea at short notice)	Battleship	1
In 'Armamento' for one month and in 'Riserva' for eleven months	Battleship	1

United States

Of recent years the United States Navy has made rapid strides. The estimates for 1907 amount to upwards of 20,000,000*l.*, in comparison with an expenditure of less than 6,000,000*l.* in 1896. Owing, however, to the excessive cost of shipbuilding and the high rates of pay which have to be provided for officers and men, the people of the United States buy their sea power at a much higher rate than any other nation. It has not of recent years been considered necessary, in view of our extremely friendly relations with the American people, to weigh the possibility of war between Great Britain and the United States. But it would, on the other hand, be unwise to fail to take into account the progress which is being made on the other side of the Atlantic in creating a fleet of great power. At the present moment the organisation of the American naval forces is undergoing considerable change, and the President has approved a proposal for amalgamating the present Pacific fleet with the Asiatic fleet, which is on duty in Chinese waters, so as to provide the admiral who will be in supreme command with a large naval force for the purposes of manœuvres. If this reorganisation scheme is carried out, it is probable that two battleships may be sent to the Philippines. This is, however, a matter of the future rather than the present. The existing plans for the maintenance of the fleet as a striking force are as follows:

Atlantic Fleet	In full commission	Battleships 1st class 16 Armoured Cruisers 4
	In reserve, probably all with small nucleus crews and ready for service within a month.	Battleships 1st class 6 Battleships 2nd class 1 Armoured Cruiser 1
Pacific Fleet	In full commission	Armoured Cruisers 4
Asiatic Fleet (China)	In full commission	Armoured Cruisers 4

France

After careful deliberation the Conseil Supérieur de la Marine have evolved a new scheme of redistribution for the French Navy, which will come into force this year. In the past France has maintained in the Far East two divisions of three ships each, of which one division has consisted of modern armoured cruisers. In place of these vessels it is now intended to maintain only four ships in these waters, and two of these will be armoured cruisers of medium size, obsolescent in equipment. In home waters it has been decided to concentrate the main striking power of the fleet in the Mediterranean, whereas hitherto there have been two divisions in the Channel and two in the Mediterranean. Under the old organisation the two divisions in the Channel comprised six battleships, and a similar number were kept in full commission in the Mediterranean. It is now determined to re-arrange the distribution of the fleet, and the Channel will be left

without any battleships. The squadrons in home waters are divided under the new scheme for providing a cheap fleet into three groups:

(1) The first will consist of the six most recent and most powerful battleships and three of the newest and biggest armoured cruisers. These ships will be kept in commission all the year round.

(2) In the second group there will be six older battleships and three armoured cruisers, and these nine vessels will be provided with what in this country would be called nucleus crews.

These twelve battleships and six armoured cruisers will be stationed in the Mediterranean, and it will be seen that the battle strength of France is to be divided so as to keep one half ready for instant action, while the remainder will be in reserve.

(3) The third group will be practically a summer training squadron. It will comprise six armoured cruisers, which will have full complements of officers and men during the six warm months of the year, and will be in harbour during the remainder with greatly reduced crews. This third group will cruise in the Atlantic and the English Channel. In addition to these vessels the French Navy will have as a 'forlorn hope' some coast-defence ships, which will be provided with maintenance crews.

In summary, therefore, the organisation of the French fleet this year will be as follows:

1st Squadron (Mediterranean) In full commission.	Battleships . .	6
	Armoured Cruisers	3
2nd Squadron (Mediterranean Reserve). . . With reduced crews.	Battleships . .	6
	Armoured Cruisers	3
3rd (Northern) Squadron In full commission in the summer only, and with one-third complements during the remaining six months.	Battleships . .	*nil*
	Armoured Cruisers	6
China Squadron In full commission.	Armoured Cruisers	2
Atlantic and Newfoundland Squadron . . In full commission.	Armoured Cruiser	1

GERMANY

Finally, there remains for consideration the German fleet. The seagoing forces of Germany are beginning to benefit in a striking manner by the shipbuilding which has been carried on for the past nine years under successive Navy Acts. The policy of the naval authorities at Berlin is to keep almost the whole naval forces of the Empire concentrated off the shores of Germany, and the ships manœuvre in the North Sea and the Baltic. The proximity of Germany to the eastern coast of Great Britain naturally results in the British people devoting a good deal of attention to the development of the Kaiser's fleet. Considering the limited expenditure of the German people upon their sea defences (the estimates for last year amounted to only just over 12,000,000*l.*), the size of the fleet which is to be maintained in full commission is very large, but this

exhibition of impressive naval power in northern waters is rendered possible only by the concentration of every armoured ship, except one which is assigned for duty in the Far East. According to official statements the armoured ships of the German Navy will be distributed as follows:

Active Battle Fleet	Battleships, 1st class	16
In full commission.	Armoured Cruisers	3
In Reserve	Battleships, 1st class	1
With reduced crews.	„ 3rd „	2
Abroad (in China)	Armoured Cruiser	1

On these brief details of the seagoing forces of rival Powers it is possible to base some comparative statements in order to ascertain how far the new organisation of the British fleet is adequate to the circumstances of the time. It will be seen that Germany maintains no battleships in the Mediterranean; she merely keeps in these waters a little steam-yacht, the *Loreley*, which acts as a stationary ship at Constantinople, and she has no armoured ships in the Atlantic. The provision which has been made for the seagoing fleets of Austria-Hungary, France, and Italy is not suggestive of aggressive designs. With these three Powers Great Britain is at present on the most friendly terms, as was indicated a few months ago, when Admiral Lord Charles Beresford and Rear-Admirals F. C. B. Bridgeman and the Hon. Sir Hedworth Lambton made a series of visits to Mediterranean ports. Under the new Admiralty scheme the British fleet in the Mediterranean will include six battleships of the *Formidable* class, modern vessels of good speed; and, as a second line, there will be the six battleships of the Atlantic fleet. In the disposition of naval forces it would be absurd to ignore the political situation, and, in view of the *entente cordiale* with France and the friendly relations existing at present, and so far as can be prophesied likely to exist for some years to come, between this country and other Mediterranean Powers, it would be difficult to sustain a claim that the provision which has been made for the maintenance of the British Mediterranean fleet is not ample, particularly in view of the immense concentration of British naval power in the English Channel, where, as already stated, France in the future will not maintain a single battleship.

Indeed, the most remarkable result of the new plans adopted by the Conseil Supérieur de la Marine is that the only Great Powers which will have battleships in northern waters will be Great Britain and Germany. Germany, as has been shown, concentrates practically all her naval strength in close proximity to her home ports. The redistribution of the British fleet indicates a similar, if not, indeed, a reciprocal, movement. Great Britain and Germany, in the coming year will face each other in battle array. The Russian fleet has been practically annihilated, and every French battleship has been with-

drawn to the Mediterranean. It is consequently inevitable in these circumstances that the Admiralty's new scheme of redistribution should be considered specifically in comparison with the naval forces which Germany will keep in full commission and in readiness for action. While it is true that Germany's Active Battle Fleet will comprise sixteen battleships, which are usually regarded as first-class, it is possible to exaggerate the striking power of these vessels. According to the latest official revelation of policy as recorded in the *Taschenbuch der Kriegsflotten*, the German Active Fleet will consist of the following armoured ships, which, it will be noticed, are of comparatively small displacement :

Class	Number of Ships	Year when completed for sea	Displacement, Metric Tons	Total Main Guns of each Group
FIRST SQUADRON.				
Wittelsbach	4	1902-3	11,800	16 9·4-in. 72 5·9-in.
Kaiser	4	1898-1901	11,150	16 9·4-in. 72 5·9-in.
SECOND SQUADRON.				
Braunschweig	5	1904-5	13,200	20 11-in. 70 6·6-in.
Deutschland	3	1905-6	13,200	12 11-in. 42 6·6-in.
CRUISER SQUADRON.				
Yorck	2	1905	9,500	12 8·2-in. 30 5·9-in.
Friedrich Karl	1	1904	9,000	

In face of such a concentration of naval power what strength ought Great Britain to keep in readiness in accordance with the principles of defence which have been tacitly accepted by the people of this country? The Admiralty's decision on this matter will merit careful consideration. It has already been announced that, when Lord Charles Beresford shifts his flag from the Mediterranean to northern waters as commander-in-chief of the Channel Fleet, he will have under his orders the following ships :

Class	Number of ships	Year when completed for sea	Displacement, Metric Tons	Total Main Guns of each group
BRITISH CHANNEL FLEET.				
King Edwards	8	1905-6	16,600	32 12-in. 32 9·2-in. 80 6-in.
Swiftsures	2	1904	12,000	8 10-in. 28 7·5-in.
Canopus	2	1900-1	13,150	16 12-in.
Majestic	2	1897-8	15,150	48 6-in.
CRUISER SQUADRON.				
Good Hope	1	1902	14,300	2 9·2-in. 16 6-in.
Hampshire	3	1905	11,000	12 7·5-in. 18 6-in.

It thus appears that Lord Charles Beresford will have at his disposal two fewer battleships than Prince Henry of Prussia in command of the German Active Fleet, but he will possess one more armoured cruiser. The difference in the size and character of the ships merits, however, attention. It is quite possible to attach too much importance to mere numerical strength, and in this particular case it happens that eight of Lord Charles Beresford's ships are most powerfully armed. These eight vessels of the *King Edward the Seventh* class may be compared with advantage with the eight vessels included in the first squadron of the active battle fleet of Germany. Each of the German ships carries four 9·4-inch guns and eighteen 5·9-inch quick-firers; while, on the other hand, each of the eight vessels of the *King Edward the Seventh* class carries four 12-inch, four 9·2-inch, and ten 6-inch guns of a new and powerful type. The contrast between these two groups of ships is certainly sufficiently effective to banish any suggestion of numerical comparison, particularly when it is borne in mind that, in addition to these eight huge battleships, Lord Charles Beresford will be supported by six other ships of the line of powerful type.

The Channel Fleet, however, does not stand alone. In case of hostilities Lord Charles Beresford, as senior Admiral with his flag flying, will have the support of the following forces:

(*a*) Normally based on the Nore, and frequently cruising in the North Sea and carrying out battle practice and other sea drills, under three admirals and a commodore, will be six battleships with the *Dreadnought* at their head, and six armoured cruisers of great power, with forty-eight destroyers. These ships will constitute the strong right arm of the Home Fleet, and from the name which has been given to this new naval force it is evidently the intention of the Admiralty that it shall never proceed, except for war service, into distant waters. The Home Fleet, if it has any meaning, must be essentially a fleet for home defence, and the twelve armoured ships of the Nore division are intended primarily for assisting in the defence of British interests in the waters which separate the eastern coast of Great Britain from the armed forces of Northern Europe.[3]

(*b*) Within easy reach of the North Sea will be the six swift battleships of the Atlantic Fleet, under two admirals, nominally based on Berehaven. This fleet would have comprised undoubtedly the six vessels belonging to the class which was lately robbed of the battleship *Montagu*. They are vessels of 14,000 tons, and of a high rate of steaming. Owing to the loss of the *Montagu* it has been necessary to replace her by a vessel of another type—namely, the *Albion*, of 12,950 tons. While this change has spoilt to some extent the homogeneity of the Atlantic Fleet, it remains a collection of powerful swift

[3] From time to time the cruisers and destroyers of the Home Fleet will 'work' for training or tactical purposes with the Channel and Atlantic Fleets.

battleships, eminently well fitted to act as the 'pivot force' of the Navy, reinforcing as circumstances may dictate either Admiral Sir Charles Drury in the Mediterranean or Admiral Lord Charles Beresford in the North Sea or English Channel, as circumstances may dictate.

(*c*) As a third line of reinforcement there will be the ships (including twelve battleships) of the Portsmouth and Devonport divisions of the Home Fleet, maintained month in and month out in a condition practically ready for war, carrying out battle practice and other drills at sea under two admirals, and with the remainder of the complements of officers and men to complete their three-fifths nucleus crews to full strength available at short notice.

If, however, these reinforcements for the defence of British interests in the North Sea are momentarily eliminated for the purpose of argument, how will the Channel Fleet alone compare with the whole Active Battle Fleet of Germany? The displacement of the British Channel Fleet of fourteen ships is, of course, much greater than that of the sixteen ships of the German Active Battle Fleet, and the speed of the English ships is not inferior, while eight of them form the swiftest and most powerful battle squadron possessed by any naval Power. In armour protection the eight vessels of the *King Edward the Seventh* type are superior to the best ships possessed by Germany, and even the other six British battleships do not compare unfavourably with the eight older vessels of the German fleet in this respect. In the matter of gun power—and, after all, fleets exist only as platforms for the mounting of heavy guns—the British Channel Fleet and the Active Battle Fleet of Germany, with their respective cruiser squadrons, supply material for an interesting comparison which is eminently reassuring. The guns carried by the British and German forces may be set out in parallel:

Guns.	British, Channel Fleet	German, Active Fleet
12-in.	48	*nil*
10-in. or 11-inch	8	32
9·2-inch or 9·4-inch	34	32
8·2-inch or 7·5-inch	40	12
Total big guns	130	76
Total smaller guns (5·9-inch to 6·6-inch)	162	286

This comparison of gun power between the British Channel Fleet alone and the whole German Active Fleet surely disposes effectively of any argument based on the numerical superiority of the German fleet to the extent of one armoured vessel. According to the interpretation of all the naval Powers of the lessons to be deduced from the war in the Far East, the 6-inch gun is a weapon of comparatively small importance at modern battle-ranges, and it is in respect of this secondary armament alone that the Germans have a superiority. In the heavier guns the British fleet has an immense advantage, and on the figures it cannot be doubted that the Channel

Fleet, though it unfortunately lacks in homogeneity (which may be only a temporary matter until other vessels are available, but is a defect), is immensely superior in gun power to the naval forces of Germany, apart from the naval power which is incorporated in the Nore division of the Home Fleet,[4] immediately at hand, and the not far distant reinforcements which have already been indicated.

These facts and figures surely completely dispose of the alarmist statements as to 'cutting down the Navy' and 'the fleets being reduced by 25 per cent.' The fact is that, with the Nore Division of the new Home Fleet, we shall have in our main fighting fleets in home waters and the Mediterranean thirty-two battleships at war strength, and France and Germany, as has been indicated, will keep only twenty-two in similar readiness. In addition we shall have the vessels in the Portsmouth and Devonport divisions of the Home Fleet, with large nucleus crews, and the men-of-war of older date, styled 'special service vessels.' In battleships ready for hostilities we shall be as thirty-two is to twenty-two in the case of France and Germany; to fourteen of France and Italy; to eight of France and Russia; to twenty-four of Italy and Germany; to twenty-seven of Italy, Germany, and Austria.

Nor does this complete the tale of the effective organisation of the British Fleet for war. In the past two years the torpedo craft have been raised to a state of high efficiency. In place of twenty-four destroyers in full commission, we shall have this year, it is officially announced, forty-eight, which will have crews up to war strength, and will be trained for war under a commodore, and upwards of twenty torpedo boats will be maintained with full crews as at present, with thirty submarines. These groups will be merely the advance guard of our horde of torpedo craft. Whereas two years ago all except twenty-four destroyers remained in reserve without crews, this year all efficient vessels will have large complements of officers and men, who will take them to sea periodically for cruises and war exercises. Attached to the Home Fleet will be flotillas on this basis numbering upwards of seventy destroyers, organised in all respects for war, with depot ships and scouts and torpedo gunboats, under senior officers responsible for the training; and lastly there will be over thirty torpedo boats. It has been stated that this 'will be' the organisation of torpedo craft, but as a matter of fact it already exists, as may be seen from the latest *Navy List*. Indeed, it may be remarked in parenthesis, it is to be regretted that the British public do not study this admirably arranged publication if they want statistics as to the organisation of the British Fleet. Here they may obtain all the facts they can require at a cost of eighteenpence, exhibited

[4] These twelve fully manned armoured ships at the Nore will mount thirty 12-inch guns, thirty-two 9·2-inch, sixteen 7·5-inch, and twenty-six 6-inch guns; they will, in fact, carry the same number of heavy guns as the whole German Active Fleet.

so lucidly as to set at rest the tremors they may sometimes experience.

It may be that the forthcoming Navy Estimates will show a further reduction in the expenditure proposed for the financial year 1907–8, and a good deal may be heard of 'A cheap Navy,' which is supposed, presumably, to be a term of contempt. As a matter of fact what the British people desire is surely an adequate fleet to maintain British supremacy unchallenged, organised on strictly business lines and as 'cheap' as they reasonably can get it. Economical administration even of the British Navy is no disgrace, and the reductions of the past two years of five millions sterling under the Unionist Government were but the first fruits of a businesslike administration of the Navy, for economies are cumulative. The saving has been accompanied by an increase in the fleet's fighting power, which cannot be better illustrated than by the two facts, that whereas in 1903 there were only twenty armoured ships in home waters with the white ensign flying and twenty-four destroyers, in the coming year there will be sixty-three armoured ships ready to respond to any emergency, with about 190 torpedo craft. The fleet, in fact, has been reorganised, with all its departments; it has been distributed in accordance with the strategic needs of the Empire, and facilities have been provided for the sea training of officers and men, from admirals downwards, such as never existed before. Apart from the officers employed on shore at the naval establishments, twenty admirals will this year have their flags flying at sea, and two commodores will show their broad pennants, in contrast with sixteen admirals and a commodore four years ago, and eleven admirals and two commodores at the beginning of this century. Consequently the senior officers of the Navy are obtaining increased experience in handling fleets and squadrons. In consequence of the development of the torpedo flotillas in association with the Home Fleet the facilities for young officers in gaining practice 'in command,' and cultivating qualities of daring and resourcefulness, are immensely improved. and the change should react beneficially on the character of the Navy as a sea force. Owing, moreover, to the elimination from the fighting fleet of ships unfit to fight or run away, but many of which nevertheless had crews in the past, some reduction in the regular *personnel* may be anticipated, if not at once, at no very distant date, particularly as modern one-calibre, big-gun ships. fitted with the simple turbine, such as the *Dreadnought*, require fewer men than older ships with mixed armaments and reciprocating engines. In all respects the big ship is economical, and consequently the *Dreadnought* policy should cause some shrinkage of the *personnel* in accordance with the views so long expressed by Lord Brassey.

In view of these considerations the British people need not be alarmed because a Government department, even though it be the Admiralty, is practising economy with efficiency. The two principles

are good bedfellows, and so long as the Admiralty maintains the sea fleets at adequate strength as it is doing, and insists on the Two-Power shipbuilding standard, as has been the case so far, there is not only no occasion for uneasiness, but rather cause for congratulation. But the nation, which profits by a policy of economical reform, accompanied by increased efficiency, should remember that, as Earl St. Vincent discovered, the work cannot be done without treading on some corns, interfering with many sinecures, disturbing vested interests and arousing conservative influences. These are the penalties, and those who suffer are not inclined to do so in silence.

ARCHIBALD HURD.

THE INVASION SCARE—A NEW VIEW

SINCE we are to depend, it seems, on a citizen army of the future—may I say the dim and distant future?—for the main defence of the Empire, or, which comes to the same thing, the Empire's heart, it may not be out of place for a humble member of the community, although devoid of military experience, to make a suggestion intended in all due modesty for the settlement of a great controversial question on a sound and permanent basis. We thank God daily that we are not as others, a military nation, and with reason. No military nation would entrust the defensive organisation of what we are prone to term the greatest empire the world ever saw to a middle-aged lawyer of philosophical bent who wastes at the War Office gifts meant for the Woolsack. Having that degree of acquaintance with Mr. Haldane which a member of Parliament of the common order can contrive to scrape with the more illustrious denizens of the Legislative Chamber, I recognise to the full his capacity, coupled with that delicate appreciation thereof known, racially, as the having of a good conceit. Yet I am not so sure that, despite a frankly admitted intellectual inferiority, I may not be as well fitted as Mr. Haldane to form a judgment on Army reform. More years ago than I care to remember I fulfilled, with as much credit as the position would admit of, the duties of private in a Volunteer corps, and to this day I would back myself for proficiency in the goose step against the right honourable gentleman. Moreover, I have an advantage over our war lord in that I am one of those high local functionaries—the deputy-lieutenants—who are to play so important a part in his scheme of territorial organisation. 'Tis true, and pity it is 'tis true, that the limits of expansion of the uniform have, as in the case of the British Army, long since been reached; but my wife's maid is handy with her needle, and, like the right honourable gentleman, I too cherish hopes of securing increased personal efficiency by a reduction of redundancy.

It is said of great leaders of men that their success has largely depended not on their own labour so much as on their capacity for setting others to work. Mr. Haldane will thank me for recalling to mind an incident which indicated in a pleasing manner his possession of this qualification for leadership. 'We had been sitting in the depth of

winter through what was euphemistically termed an autumn session, and it was a question of adjourning over Christmas. The then leader of the House suggested a recess so short that even his staunchest supporters murmured. Thereupon, from a back bench, uprose the hon. member for Haddingtonshire, and in a stirring call to duty rebuked the sluggards and besought the Minister to stand by his original proposal. The subsequent discovery that the author of this patriotic appeal, like the discreet commander who 'fled full soon on the first of June, but bade the rest keep fighting,' had paired with a political opponent for a period extending beyond the limits of the proposed adjournment, and would, therefore, not be present if the House reassembled then, enabled us to realise the true force of this effective stroke of masterly inactivity.

Though I no longer enjoy the privilege of listening to Ministerial expositions from the green benches of the House of Commons, I have had sufficient experience of that branch of the Legislature to be able to appreciate the difficulties that lie in the way of a representative of the War Office who would be something more than the mere mouthpiece of his permanent officials and his military advisers. The House is sympathetic enough to the rising statesman. Cheers from friends and foes invariably greet the Minister who addresses the House for the first time from the Treasury Bench. Curiosity to mark how an untried man will acquit himself in a position of responsibility ensures a full and attentive audience. I was myself an interested witness of Mr. Wyndham's *début* as Under-Secretary of State for War. Mr. Wyndham had a reputation to maintain on several grounds. *Bene natus, bene vestitus*, well looking, and master of an easy flow of poetical English, expectation ran high, nor did he fall short of it. We spoke of his speech as a great one; of the scheme which he expounded we retained only a dim, but, I think, a favourable, impression, for I have a distinct recollection of joining with my colleagues in loudly applauding the statement that 70,000 Volunteers had been 'allocated' to the defence of London. How they were to be armed, how transported, how fed, no one inquired nor wanted to know. It was enough that they had been 'allocated'—a remarkable instance of the power of an appropriate word to set doubts at rest.

A speech fluently delivered, and in this regard Mr. Haldane may not inaptly be termed the quick-firer of the Cabinet, in well-chosen language, and sprinkled with phrases so turned as to pass muster for epigrams, will keep the attention of an assembly that has no relish for facts and figures, and, as to the major part, little knowledge, and that mostly inaccurate, of the subject under discussion. The indisposition or inability to deal effectively with the substance of a matter is most marked in the debates in Committee on the votes for the Services, especially the Army votes. To the Minister whose only object, after he has scored with a telling speech, is to get his votes

through with as little trouble as possible, an empty or inattentive House is a Godsend. But to the Minister who looks for guidance, information, assistance, and support from the great council of the nation, and who does not regard the making of a brilliant speech as the whole duty of a statesman, it is a sad discouragement to find how apathetic and indifferent the bulk of members are when the defence of the Empire is under discussion, and how feeble are the criticisms of the few who take part therein.

Should we lay the blame of conduct so apparently unpatriotic on the Legislature alone? I think not. Is it not rather the case that the House of Commons in this respect does but reflect the temper of the nation? Let us see. Quite recently the war in South Africa revealed the gravest defects in our military system, and, for the moment, it seemed as though the country, thoroughly roused to a sense of its insecurity, would demand that the defects should forthwith be made good; yet in the few short years that have passed since the end of the war its lessons have been forgotten, its warnings go unheeded, and the commander who brought it to a successful, if inglorious conclusion, might be crying in the wilderness for all the effect his appeals to their patriotism have on his fellow-countrymen. We set our rulers an impossible task. We expect them to make bricks without straw; to provide us with a kind of salvation army without money and without men. With the full knowledge that if ever these shores were invaded, it would be by the most powerful force of picked men that an enemy could raise, we are content to rely for their defence on levies of makeshift soldiers whom our war lord proposes to turn into trained men after hostilities have begun. Our most experienced general, unable to persuade the adult population to take their due share in the defence of their country, begs for a handful of sovereigns in order to provide means for teaching the young to shoot, and we present him with a brass farthing. In the hour of our direst need, when we were threatened with the loss of some of the fairest dominions of the Crown, our Colonial fellow-subjects flew to the rescue and averted a great disaster. Our return for this service and our encouragement to them and to our countrymen in other climes to do likewise in a similar emergency is to place the government in the hands of men who, in pursuance of a fatal policy of conciliation by concession, hasten to undo with the stroke of a pen what thousands of brave men laid down their lives to accomplish. We acquiesce with a grumble in the reduction of the Navy, our first, and as some would have it, the only line of defence we need, a defence without which we might invoke Providence in vain to give us day by day our daily bread, and this in the face of the huge increase of a neighbouring fleet which only diplomatists pretend not to be designed to dispute with us at no distant date the mastery of the sea.

If, then, the Legislature be apathetic, so are we. Let us look to

ourselves. Are our working classes, the men whose most preposterous demands we are ready to concede because they can out-vote us at the polls, concerned for the maintenance and defence of the Empire? I doubt it. Higher wages, less work, and liberty to bully such of their own kith and kin as venture to hold opinions different from those of the majority are all their care. Their leaders, who, when it is a question of coercing fellow workmen, are the blatant advocates of brute force, condemn the instruction of the young in the barest elements of national defence lest they should be infected with a spirit of militarism. Their organisations are directed to the shirking of work, not to the doing of it; to the discouragement of energy and enterprise and to the reduction of the ablest to the level of the laziest and least intelligent. Good workmanship, on which the once wide-world reputation of British manufactures was justly built, is a thing of the past. To-day the main object of the British workman is not to turn out goods made in the best way, but to spread work among the greatest number of workers, at the same rate of pay to all, without regard to quality or to individual merit. Complaining of want of employment, crowds of able-bodied men can afford to spend days in idleness watching professional players at games they are not athletic enough to engage in themselves. Can we put our trust in men of this temperament, or is there any help in them?

Take the middle classes next; the bulk of these are without doubt true patriots—in spirit. If good wishes and excellent intentions were as effective for national defence as fleets and armies, we should be secure enough. These good folks intend to be active in their country's service some day; but nothing can be done without money, so they must make their pile first. This process being increasingly arduous, and making inroads on health and strength that even week-ends devoted to golf cannot repair, they find, when the process is effected, if it ever is, that whisky and Vichy water, on which they nourish the gout, quench the ardour of patriotism, and the good intentions of their youth are fulfilled in middle-age by a guinea's subscription to the prize fund of a local Volunteer corps.

Take now the upper ranks of society. Here we have men, it is true, not wanting in public spirit. The noble lord in the chair, at once so affable and so dignified, is a sight for sore eyes. He is so patriotic too. His faith in the British soldier who can go anywhere and do anything is unbounded. Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, and Lord Milner are his heroes, and what thunders of applause greet the eulogy he bestows on each. He takes the British Empire, that Empire he reminds us on which the sun never sets, under his wing, and we were never so impressed with its greatness and its permanence. But the noble lord does not confine himself to patriotic platitudes. He exhorts us as practical men to put our shoulders to the wheel and perfect our organisation. His friend, by whom he is so glad to

be supported, the Hon. Tom Noddy, will, therefore, propose a resolution which will be seconded by their valued representative in Parliament, Mr. Blank. But the noble lord is a busy man. He has overworked himself in the London season and must undergo his annual cure. He has a yacht, too long laid up, foundering for a cruise. He has a moor, and possibly a deer forest in Scotland, and hosts of friends to visit and entertain. Unhappily, too, the countess is delicate and cannot winter in England, so there is the villa in the south of France, where, in a balmy region within easy reach of Monte Carlo, her ladyship's ailments and those of her family, for they are all delicate, too, are forgotten, and the noble lord regrets that, owing to the prevalence of agricultural depression, his subscription to the funds of the association must be limited to a guinea, and the loan of a motor-car at election time. Thus, when we come to reckon the results of the noble lord's efforts, reminiscences of our schooldays supply us with an appropriate summary of them, and we exclaim 'Vox et præterea nihil.' But what of the younger branches of the aristocracy, surely they take an active part in their country's defence? Unquestionably they do. No braver fellows were ever ambushed by the enemy or ever led Tommy Atkins to destruction with more reckless gallantry. I remember, during the Boer War, to have seen a long list of noble families thrown into mourning through the deaths of youthful relatives, victims to the indomitable pluck and the invincible ignorance of the well-born British officer. A short while ago the tenantry of the young heir to the estate of a late highly-respected member of the House of Commons celebrated his coming of age by a presentation of plate, and the recipient in returning thanks on the occasion declared his intention of coming to live permanently on his property after spending 'a few more years in the Army.' The announcement was received with rapturous applause by an audience whose gratification at the early prospect of a landlord in residence rendered them insensible to the slender regard in which that gentleman held the profession he had adopted. Mr. Haldane would have the county gentlemen, the deputy-lieutenants, and the like, lend their aid in the organisation and direction of the local forces, and thinks the suggestion would be favourably received by the parties in question, because 'it would give them something to do.' Is not the reason why so many young men of the upper ranks of society enter the Army, to give them something not too exacting to do until such time as they step into their fathers' shoes or marry rich wives? Yet is the country the better or the stronger for their services? How can it be? They not only take up room which would be better filled by men who intend to pursue a military career, and block the avenue to promotion, but by their expensive habits they deter men of moderate means from following the profession of arms. But the young men of good family, whose period of service in the Army is little else than an unconsidered incident in their lives,

by no means exhaust the category of well-to-do citizens with leisure to devote their wealth and such faculties as they possess to the service of the State. Do we observe among the latter any special concern for the safety, honour, and welfare of the realm? I trow not. It is to these and such as these that Lord Roberts applied for help to found and maintain miniature rifle clubs for the instruction of the young in marksmanship, and it was by these that he was sent empty away. The Militia and the Volunteers are lamentably short of officers, yet none offer to make good a deficiency that multitudes at a trifling sacrifice of time and money could supply. Even in their sports, the business of their lives, many men could, if they would, fulfil functions of use to the State. The shires are now crowded with hunting men who, of necessity, must become past masters of the topography of their respective countries. What admirable local guides such men would make in case of invasion! Yet, I doubt, if such a body were raised, whether one hunting man in a hundred would take the trouble to join it. So with the motorists. These, it is true, though they have added a new terror to life, are, by eliminating the blind, the halt, the maimed, and the careless, assisting Nature to carry out her law of the survival of the fittest, and by thus counteracting the baleful influence of societies for the care of the feeble-minded, the protection of infant life, and similar institutions, do a public service. Yet they might largely extend their sphere of usefulness. Setting aside, as of lesser account, their capacity for throwing dust in the eyes of the enemy, they constitute a vast locomotive army, familiar with all the main roads and most of the byways in the kingdom, an army only requiring to be organised to be of incalculable use in the event of a hostile landing on our shores. But that they or the rest of the throng, miscalled gay, who in their endeavours to escape from the tedium of a listless life, have almost solved the problem of perpetual motion; whose search after excitement is so laborious, whose busy idleness is so strenuous as to tempt one to parody a celebrated saying and exclaim 'Oh, pleasure, what pangs are endured in thy pursuit,' could be persuaded to sit still and think on their country's danger, and how they could help to avert it, is a vain hope.

Is it not true then that if the Legislature be apathetic and indifferent in matters that concern the defence and maintenance of the Empire, the community, to whatever class the members of it severally belong, is so too? Why are we so? I make bold to say that it is because as a race we are degenerating. We are less robust both in mind and body than those stalwart ancestors whose valour founded and whose wisdom maintained the Empire which, professing to be so proud of, we are so little concerned to preserve. Wealth and the getting of it engross our thoughts, engage our affections, and inspire our respect. All things are forgiven to the successful trader. We pass sanitary laws to safeguard the health of the people, but dare not

enforce them lest we should lessen the ill-gotten gains of smart men of business. In spite of adulteration Acts and Acts to secure to the buyer the genuineness of the commodities he wants, imposition meets us at every turn, imposition openly winked at. The men who do these things, who suffer these things, who applaud these things belong to a demoralised race. They have lost the qualities that go to the making of noble characters. Their conduct is as petty as their aims. They justify the most ignoble means provided the ends to be attained be wealth, pleasure, or social distinction. Patriotism to them is but an after-dinner sentiment to be roused by the strains of the National Anthem. They do not want to hear of the responsibilities of Empire which they shirk, or to be warned of dangers which they shrink from, lest they should be forced to realise the fool's paradise in which they live.

To overcome the *vis inertiæ* of a degenerate race is, as Mr. Haldane has discovered, a task beyond the powers of the ablest statesman. Failing to find efficiency at home our war minister seeks it abroad, and we are not humiliated. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*; yet Napoleon *bourgeois* at Berlin, learning how to organise an army, is a spectacle that would be pathetic if it were not so ridiculous. Mr. Haldane has recounted to his constituents his kindly reception at the Imperial Court and the valuable information he received from the officials of the German War Department. I wonder if they told him all they knew about this country and this country's oversea possessions—for they know a good deal and their knowledge is not confined to official circles. At the beginning of the Boer War a young German applied for and obtained employment in the establishment of a firm of manufacturers in Glasgow. Dining with one of the principals the conversation turned on the war, and the host (my informant) expressed the then general opinion that in three months' time the British forces would enter Pretoria. 'Not for three years,' said the young German, "for amongst other reasons your officers are wholly unacquainted with the country. I know the Transvaal,' he continued, 'better than any British soldier.' 'What, have you been in South Africa?' asked my friend. 'Never,' replied his guest, 'but during my term of military service we were set to study on the excellent maps we possess what it was then thought would shortly be the theatre of war between the English and the Dutch, and I believe,' he added, 'that I could find my way in the Transvaal in any direction.' By a coincidence the other principal in the same firm, the brother of my informant, happened about the same time to be staying at the Imperial Hotel, Torquay, where he met and became on friendly terms with a German officer who told him the object of his visit to England. This was to make himself acquainted with the topography of Yorkshire, a task he had then completed. How thoroughly may be conceived when by way of putting in a nutshell the results of his labour he said, 'I know

every blacksmith's shop in the county.' What English officer could say as much of any county in Great Britain? I venture to say not one.

If to perfect the military organisation of the Empire after the most approved model be Mr. Haldane's aim, he should not be content with taking counsel with the officials of the German War Department, but should solicit their active co-operation in this country. Many, if not most, of our largest commercial undertakings are managed with conspicuous success by Germans. Why not follow so praiseworthy an example? Invite the Kaiser to nominate German officers to the chief military commands and fill the subordinate posts at the War Office and Horse Guards with German clerks who would work as hard again as the present occupants of them for less than half their pay, and thus secure the two objects Mr. Haldane has most at heart—efficiency and economy. This proposal, though it has much to recommend it, would not, however, go to the root of the evil—the degeneracy of the English race. This can only be cured by a change of blood, a remedy for which the few who look beyond the passions and idols of the hour to the permanent interests of the nation must ardently yearn. How then can a change of blood be effected? Clearly by a fusion of the English with a manlier race—a race retaining the qualities that make for patriotism—qualities which, as I think I have shown, we have lost. What race so fitted for this noble purpose as that whose progenitors in the dawn of our history overran these islands and left an impress on our language, our literature, our laws, and our constitution still visible—the Teutonic. It is conceivable that the Germanisation of England might be brought about by peaceable means. German manufacturers, German merchants, German traders, German financiers take the place of English in the metropolis and in our chief industrial centres. The recent purchase by German capitalists of coalfields whose produce is essential to the very existence of our fleet may be regarded as an earnest of similar acquisitions of equal, if not greater, national value. But although the course of events tends in the direction of the absorption of our trade and commerce and so ultimately to the preponderating influence of those whom we now style 'foreigners' in the business life of this country, the process must necessarily be a slow one. It would be long before its beneficial effect would be felt in our social life, and it would be liable at any time by some inconsiderate action on the part of the Legislature to receive a set-back. Manifestly a quicker method of racial rejuvenation would be preferable to the assimilation which at present in an undeveloped or embryonic stage may take centuries to complete.

Although the British Isles have been successfully invaded by Romans, Danes, Saxons, and Normans we often talk as though they were virgin soil on which no foe had ever set foot. The lapse of eight and a half centuries since the last of these so-called conquests may

excuse some forgetfulness of the events themselves but cannot justify a failure to recognise the blessings that have flowed from them. The Roman conquest of Britain, being never more than a military occupation, has left few traces on the national character, but East Anglia can still boast stalwart descendants of Danish ancestors, while the very tongue we speak owes its beauty and its expressiveness in the main to our Saxon progenitors. On the Norman conquest it is needless to dwell. Poets in rapturous strains have sung of Norman blood. The most eloquent writer of the day whom none can accuse of want of patriotism—Mr. Kipling—in the latest of his works tells how Norman and Saxon laboured in harmony for the common weal. Our good friends across the water recognise with pride the beneficent influence on our national character of the great movement that originated in their own land. 'It is probable,' says a too partial and, I fear, not too discerning an admirer writing in the *Gaulois* so lately as June last, 'that the English owe their thoughtfulness, their social discipline, the justice of their views, and the surety of their judgment to the Norman Conquest.' Yet notwithstanding these glorious results of the fusion of races, Englishmen are still to be found who would deprecate a repetition of the procedure whereby such results were effected. To my mind it is an affair of words. We are dominated by words. Let us no longer, then, speak of 'invasion,' that word of fear to the ignorant and the prejudiced, but substituting therefor 'visitation in force' allay the alarms of the foolish without sacrificing the claims of truth. How a German visitation in force is to be accomplished is a detail on which I do not feel called on to offer advice. Fortunately, we are not without an instructor. An ingenious writer, under the guise of an historian of the future, has compiled what he himself implies may be regarded as a complete guide to the Conquest of England. Armed with this admirable *vade mecum* no foreign commander need go astray or miss the most effective strategical positions to be found in our island home. It is to be hoped that this philanthropist will crown his labours by personally conducting to victory the regenerators of the race.

I am free to admit that a visitation such as I have suggested rather than described may be attended by some discomfort. One cannot make omelets without breaking eggs. It is possible that some misguided individuals, masquerading as patriots, not content with the show of resistance which is all that our forces as at present organised could be expected to offer, might proceed to acts of violence that would lead to a breach of the peace. It is pretty certain, too, that the owners of many palaces but no homes would be dispossessed of some if not all of them. This result, however, would be but a speedier realisation of the aims of our own socialists, while the sufferers would always have their villas in the Riviera to retire to. Probably also the inmates of the Poplar Workhouse might miss some of their accustomed luxuries, but on the whole, so far as their material interests are concerned, the

masses would be the chief gainers by the visitation. The sack of London and other great cities would give to the twelve millions who, on the authority of the Prime Minister, are on the verge of starvation that 'equality of opportunity' which is now a recognised article of the Radical Creed, and bring about in a simple but effective manner the redistribution of wealth which at present is limited to the erection of free libraries. Not that I would be thought to disparage these institutions. They will make excellent barracks for the German garrison. But if the masses would reap the most material benefit from the fusion of races let it not be supposed that the rest of the community would not have reason to heartily appreciate the results of this great Teutonic Combine. The Labour leaders who love to tyrannise over their fellows would find in some German proconsul a despot after their own heart. The professors of the higher patriotism, true to their motto: 'My country, always in the wrong,' would have leisure to study the intricacies of the laws of *lèse majesté*, whilst even the few to whom the new order of things might at first prove distasteful would be soothed and cheered by the reflection that five hundred years hence their descendants would be as proud of having 'come over with the Germans' as we should be now of Norman ancestry.

C. W. Radcliffe Cooke.

CONSERVATIVE OPPORTUNISTS AND IMPERIAL DEMOCRACY

MANY Unionists naturally prefer at present to look forward to the future, which may have good fortune in store for them, rather than backwards into the immediate past, which is black with a great party disaster. This attitude is very human when adopted by the leaders who are directly responsible for that disaster. And yet it is precisely at times such as these that a healthy mind seeks courage in the past, searching in the party records for the causes of defeat and regaining hope and vigour by studying the means through which earlier disasters were repaired. It is necessary to go back more than twenty years to find history repeating itself, and then the outlook of the Conservative party was not one whit less gloomy than is that of the Unionist party to-day. One man more than any other restored the fallen fortunes of Conservatism. His success was due no more to his striking personality and vigorous methods than to the new faith which he preached. While, therefore, we may have to wait many a dreary day for the individual who can repeat Lord Randolph Churchill's triumphs in Opposition, we may well ask ourselves whether a departure from his faith is not the origin of the evils which have befallen us.

The fact that the Empire is again threatened with the revival, under a new disguise, of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy is in itself sufficient to recall to the minds of Conservatives the last occasion on which this policy was defeated, and to turn their thoughts to the man who not only led the assault on the Home Rule ranks, but, by preaching Tory democracy, prepared Conservatism for that coalition of apparently conflicting principles on which the Unionist party was founded.

Murmurs are, indeed, heard from the party rank and file, complaining that it was because the Conservative leaders had lost sight of the essential principles of Tory democracy that they so utterly failed to command the confidence of the people at the recent elections. But deeper and more widespread is the consciousness that the abandonment of these principles accounts for the lack of cohesion throughout the party itself, far more than the immediate issues raised by the Fiscal question. The more thoughtful Unionists—above all, those men who have given their adherence to the Unionist party for the reason

that their ideals cannot be reconciled with the official programme of Liberalism—are awaiting anxiously for some definite pronouncement from the Conservative leaders as to their relation to those democratic principles which can alone give permanency to the party, and without a frank acknowledgment of which the party cannot reasonably hope again to be returned to power.

Their anxiety is not allayed, it is rather increased, by the energy in decrying Tory democracy which its natural enemies are at this moment displaying. They regard it as significant that, with the possible exception of a letter from Sir John Gorst (the *Times*, the 6th of February, 1907), the perpetuation of Lord Randolph's memory should have been left, during the last eventful eighteen months, to two supporters of the party which still bears the scars of the wounds he inflicted, and to one of the few surviving representatives of that older type of Conservatism which he had to keep at bay with his left hand while he was fighting Liberalism with his right. Their anxiety and their suspicions certainly do not appear groundless if the motives, complicated, no doubt, by a genuine admiration for the subject of their memoirs, of the three most recent writers on Lord Randolph and Tory democracy are examined from the Unionist point of view.

It is generally conceded that Mr. Winston Churchill has performed brilliantly the task entrusted to him by his father's literary executors. But Mr. Churchill in his own career has chosen to disregard the conventions of party morality; and it comes as no surprise to those who have watched his advancement that he has endeavoured throughout his story to persuade his readers that, if Lord Randolph had been guided by the logic of his convictions, he would have deserted the Conservative fold and embraced Liberalism. That, at any rate, is the impression which his book leaves on their minds. Lord Randolph's public life is, however, the property of his party, and it is strange that none of his friends, who are still among the foremost of Unionist leaders, should have bestirred themselves to refute this teaching at least as eagerly as Lord Rosebery has sprung forward to support it and drive it home. A party which has lost the confidence of a large number of its supporters is doing something very like courting extinction when it allows a deserter from its ranks to preach unchallenged such dangerous doctrines to the many malcontents who still owe it allegiance. Its silence certainly lends colour to the suspicion that the Conservative leaders have lost sight of the Tory working man, and of many other progressive elements among the people, to whom they owe their long continuance in office; and that it is their intention to use the small Unionist remnant in Parliament as the nucleus of a party reconstructed on narrow and undemocratic lines.

Lord Rosebery, in an essay full of that literary charm associated with all his writings, endorses Mr. Churchill's view in the capacity of a personal friend of Lord Randolph, but of one 'who was always

his political opponent.' Tory democracy, in Lord Rosebery's opinion, was and apparently still is 'an imposture, an honest and unconscious imposture, no doubt, but none the less an imposture.' He cannot classify it, and he does not pretend to understand it, but he damns it as 'the wolf of Radicalism in the sheepskin of Toryism.' To that conclusion all his argument is directed; but at times his criticism puzzles the simple-minded reader. He has an incomparable sense of humour, which occasionally seems to carry him into the borderland of the disingenuous; as, for instance, when quoting the opening sentences of the well-known Mafeking letter: 'So Arthur Balfour is really leader, and Tory democracy, the genuine article, is at an end,' he observes: 'It is not easy to trace the subtle connection between the leadership of Mr. Balfour and the disappearance of the genuine article.'

Lord Hugh Cecil, writing in an antistrophic strain in the *Dublin Review*, endeavours to direct Lord Rosebery's criticisms of Tory democracy into a practical and constructive channel. He makes as direct an appeal as political exigencies permit to Lord Rosebery to come out of his retirement and lead 'those central-minded people' who 'find their views ill-expressed on either side Parliament.' The incongruity of this chorus is so obvious that there is little danger of its two members arriving simultaneously at the 'central' altar, still less of their conspiring to play leading parts on the political stage. For, whatever may have been Lord Rosebery's political failings, he has never been accused of opportunism. To him 'the Tory creed, so far as it implies maintenance of historical continuity and calculated, practical, well-meditated reform without unnecessary risk to precious institutions, is a respectable and healthy faith.' Lord Hugh Cecil, on the other hand, finds salvation in the discovery of 'the large element of opportunism in Conservative leadership.' His faith is thus defined: 'Apart from the extensive region of legislation which is not of a controversial party character, and in which either party may consistently find room for its activities, there arise from time to time demands for changes in the law which, while Conservatives do not approve them absolutely on their merits, are yet assented to and even promoted by Conservatives as being relatively acceptable, as being expedient in order to escape from some impending disaster or some worse legislative remedy.' If Lord Hugh Cecil had added that the Conservatives who are affected by this kind of opportunism are strongly moved by the very human desire of holding their seats at an election, and if he had argued that many of them submitted to Lord Randolph's Tory democracy because they were quick to perceive that he was winning the electorate to his side, nobody could have contradicted him. But if he means to imply that Tory democracy—'the genuine article'—was the same thing as Conservative opportunism, then either he does not understand the British people, or it

was 'an imposture,' and, the electorate having been once bitten, will ever remain shy. Lord Hugh Cecil is, however, only prepared to admit that it was an imposture if 'it is understood to mean what Lord Randolph preached two or three years after his resignation, when he advanced far towards Liberalism, or even Radicalism.' It therefore looks as if the key to Lord Hugh Cecil's attitude towards Tory democracy is to be found in a peculiar failure to see deep into the public mind, taking it, of course, for granted, that both he and Lord Rosebery, as practical politicians, regard the British public as the only possible object of an 'imposture.'

Of the three writers, Mr. Churchill has best realised the true meaning of Tory democracy. That he has perverted it into a justification for joining the Liberal ranks is an incident which should not be allowed to affect its future development. Lord Rosebery condemns it as an imposture. Lord Hugh Cecil fails utterly to appreciate its character; but he recognises its inspiration, and seems to wish to steal the fire in order to animate the clay which he hopes, with Lord Rosebery's assistance, some day to mould into the new party of 'central-minded people.' If that is his intention, it is to be feared that he is doomed to disappointment; and that, if ever in the *rôle* of a political Prometheus he attempts to apply the fire, he will discover that it is not 'the genuine article' which he has stolen. Is it a dread of Tory democracy in the future that prompts one of the foremost of Liberals to attempt to overwhelm it with all the force of his unique satire and eloquence; and an older type of Conservative, who finds himself in a position of political isolation, not dissimilar to that to which Lord Rosebery's genius has leant a peculiar distinction, to endeavour to divert it from its natural rocky channels into the placid plains of opportunism? Does a belated realisation of the lost opportunity of carrying forward the torch he had directly inherited reveal to Mr. Churchill the danger to his own career likely to arise from a recrudescence among those he has deserted of Lord Randolph's principles? Is it a mere coincidence that these three writers, emerging from different camps, should make common cause in attacking Tory democracy, and should at the same time be in agreement in opposing Imperialism in its more recent developments? These are questions which should suggest themselves to the official leaders of the Unionist party; if they are wise they will learn from the enemy, and make such public answers as will restore confidence to their wavering followers and expose the insidious nature of the combined attack.

Meanwhile the rank and file of the Unionist party may be permitted to trace for themselves the development of Tory democracy. Sir John Gorst, still faithful to the memory of the Fourth party, has defended the political principles of his former colleague against Lord Rosebery's attack, but his definition of Tory democracy leaves it where Lord Randolph left it. He deplores its abandonment by the

Conservative party, but does not explain the dynamic and progressive force which breathed through all Lord Randolph's speeches, carried conviction to his audiences, and was a terror to his opponents. It was that force which saved Lord Randolph's eloquence from being as ephemeral in its effect as mere invective. Tory democracy has passed through many vicissitudes since then, but it is still a living force, notwithstanding the implied wish of Lord Rosebery and the plaint of Sir John Gorst. Lord Rosebery, it is true, inconsistently hints at its having planted its seed in the future. He makes no suggestion, however, that from this seed has sprung Imperial democracy as yet a tender growth in the shelter of the Unionist party. Imperial democracy, is, nevertheless, the immediate offspring of Lord Randolph's teaching, and it is in its development since the days of his ascendency that the answer is to be found to those who regard Tory democracy as an imposture or as a departed faith, because, hedged in by the limitations of an earlier day, they are unable to place it in any system governed by the laws on which they base their political science.

Times have changed since the days when Tory democracy was at its zenith, and the creed which it inspired has changed with them. In the few years that have elapsed since Lord Randolph's retirement the world has moved fast and the position of England is not, and can never be again, what it was. In his days the rivalry of no foreign nation was regarded as threatening England's existence. Then it was still possible to conceive of a 'Little England' growing and prospering behind the shelter of the seas. But there has come to the people of these islands the consciousness that two great Empires have arisen, which, in the ordinary course of competition between nations, must sooner or later challenge the position occupied in a world of nations by 'Little England' and her dependencies. Both these Empires have greater resources to draw upon in a struggle with England, whether that struggle be conducted by the methods of war, in which destruction is immediate, or by the methods of peace, in which destruction is slower, possibly more remote, but no less sure. The one, Germany, has organised all these resources and concentrated them on a common aim; the other, the United States, though actually possessing little more than nominal unity, is no less capable of organising and concentrating her vaster resources whenever occasion may demand. It is this consciousness which has given rise in England during recent years to some conception of a nation as an organised unit.

The consciousness of the unity of an Empire has followed quickly. In Lord Randolph's day the great colonies were regarded as little more than oversea extensions of Great Britain, affording the British race a means of expansion. Such sense of Imperial unity as then existed found its ultimate expression in the homage rendered by all parts of her dominions—a homage based largely on a personal devotion still inseparable from her memory—to Queen Victoria on her two

Jubilees. But meanwhile the great colonies, as an inevitable result of the self-government which had been conceded to them, had developed rapidly along democratic lines. They had evolved the new conception of a vast union of democracies under a common Crown, and as they had increased in strength they had urged that conception on the Mother Country with growing insistence. Next to their own national development, its realisation was their first political object, and they were prepared to resist, if necessary by arms, any outside interference with its attainment. Thus, while in Lord Randolph's time the defeat at Majuba was regarded at the worst as a humiliation to the British arms, the Boer challenge to British supremacy in 1899 was recognised immediately throughout the Empire as an assault on British Imperialism, and the idea of Imperial unity triumphed over all subordinate racial or political differences. The great democratic self-governing colonies sent their soldiers to fight side by side with the troops of Great Britain in a war which was undertaken by a Unionist Government and which was directed by that Government throughout its fluctuating fortunes. The Liberals dissociated themselves from the general approval of the war shown throughout the Empire; it is true that some of their representatives in Parliament spoke in its support, but they almost invariably recorded their votes against it.

Then came the Colonial Conference of 1902, which it was anticipated would give some permanent shape to the conception of Imperial unity that had found material expression in the war. This second Conference, like the first, assembled under the auspices of a Unionist Government. The Liberals and a small minority of narrower Conservatives held aloof throughout the sympathetic exchange of opinion which took place during this period between the Mother Country and the Colonies. In the lobbies the more reckless of the Liberals referred slightingly to colonial statesmen as 'parish councillors,' in clubs and drawing-rooms some of the cynics among Conservatives objected to 'people who tell us in a loud voice the things we already know'—an elementary characteristic of democracy, in which the spirit of youth always predominates. But the mass of the Unionist party entered into an alliance with the great body of colonial sentiment on the basis of Imperial democracy; it made itself in this country the representative of those Imperial aspirations which are in their essence democratic. Whether it accepted this *rôle* consciously or unconsciously it is impossible to say; but in so doing it was merely acting under the influences of those forces which Lord Randolph Churchill had introduced into the party, and was carrying his teaching to an incomparably more logical conclusion than that adopted by his son in his short-sighted and misguided conversion to Liberalism.

As is now known, the Colonial Conference of 1902 made clear the fact that Imperial preference is the only means by which the permanent unity of the Mother Country and all the Colonies can be initiated.

An overwhelming majority of the Unionist party gave Mr. Chamberlain its support when, for the second time in his career, he went out into the desert to preach the unity of the Empire. The Whigs and Conservative opportunists who had no sympathy with democratic ideals formed the minority which opposed him, or gave only a half-hearted approval to the principles he advocated.

Lord Randolph and Mr. Gladstone, the one in a positive the other in a negative way, were perhaps equally responsible for the association of the Unionist party with this policy. The Radicals who cut themselves adrift from Mr. Gladstone's disruptive activities could not have joined a coalition that would have represented Whig-Conservative tendencies had not Lord Randolph stirred into activity the democratic instincts which were dormant in the Conservative party. Whether Lord Salisbury foresaw that it would not be the Whigs and Conservative opportunists who would dominate the coalition is a question which opens up an interesting chapter in political history. It is at least probable, judging from the many utterances in his speeches recognising the democratic tendencies of his time, that he had no intention of forming an unprogressive amalgamation of the kind which Lord Hugh Cecil now adumbrates. He was too far-seeing a politician not to perceive that new blood and new forces were essential to the Conservative party if it was to continue to be one of the great instruments for guiding the national destinies. But however that may be, it was inevitable that on the ground which Lord Randolph had prepared Mr. Chamberlain's constructive genius should erect some definite practical policy, in which progressive social reform—not Lord Hugh Cecil's changes which are 'expedient in order to escape from some impending disaster or some worse legislative remedy'—should play a prominent part. It was natural that, as the official representative of the Mother Country in its dealings with the Colonies, he should form the link between the democratic elements in this country, whose support he had brought to the Unionist Government, and the democracy of the Colonies. And when at last he left the Unionist Government it enjoyed the confidence of the Colonies as no British Government had ever enjoyed it before. To them it was the guardian of Imperial democracy; while to this country it represented a constructive Imperial policy in which all social classes—with the possible exception of those Whig and plutocratic elements which make for oligarchy—might find a common aim. Surely at that moment the Unionist party held its future in its own hands.

On the other hand, it is possible that, had Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy not driven Mr. Chamberlain out of the Liberal party, Imperialism, as we now know it, might never have been. Before the secession Mr. Chamberlain was already regarded with suspicion by devout Liberals as one who was always ready to defend our national rights. Writing to Lord Spencer in 1882, Lord Granville remarked:

'We have had several Cabinets, more or less formal, about Egypt. Bright, of course, the most peaceable, Chamberlain almost the greatest Jingo.' The Liberal party has invariably abhorred the positive attitude of the man who does not want to fight, but who reminds the world that he is prepared to do so if necessary. It has ever been strongly influenced by a section which dreams vainly of a world composed of small nations, and has conscientious objections to the defence of right by arms, or even to the preparation for war as a means of ensuring peace. The sentiments of this section have now found expression in Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's vision of Great Britain at the head of an international league of peace, to obtain which position it would seem necessary that she should first place herself at the mercy of her enemies. The Conservative party, on the other hand, has always believed, in theory at any rate, in the strenuous pursuit of the destinies of the people of these islands. Conservatives have been prepared to accept, when they heard it, the challenge of any nation whose destinies are in fatal rivalry to our own. War, with all its terrors of rapid destruction, represents to them the last sacrifice which the individual can make in the fulfilment of his duty to the nation. In this light it has for them the highest moral sanction.

To such a party one aspect of Mr. Chamberlain's Imperial views appeared as little more than a truism. No greed of conquest or desire for mere national aggrandisement was the foundation of Unionist Imperialism. The rivalry of other empires with larger populations than ours had drawn the eyes of the more far-seeing Conservatives to the millions of our fellow-subjects across the seas. A defensive and offensive bond between the Colonies and the Mother Country appeared to them to be the only possible means of securing the necessary 'man-power' to meet the competition of Germany and the United States. There was nothing in this foreign to the older Conservative traditions. But the democratic tendencies displayed by the Unionist Government between 1895 and 1903, the period during which Mr. Chamberlain was at the Colonial Office—tendencies which represented the very essence of an Imperialism acceptable to the Colonies—would hardly have been tolerated by Conservatives who had not passed through the fiery period of Lord Randolph's ascendency. And even now many broad-minded Conservatives, who are able to regard with a not unfriendly eye the development of the Colonies along democratic lines, might view with some misgiving the positive promotion of social reform at home, were not the conviction growing upon them that England has entered upon another phase of her destinies, in which she may be called upon once more to meet her rivals in arms.

Like many a saying that has become hackneyed by rough and thoughtless usage, 'Dulce et decorum est . . .' has been placed by

the gentlemen of England on the index of cant utterances; but it nevertheless expresses one of the fundamental principles of their lives, and many of them are asking themselves to-day whether, under modern conditions, the mass of the people have an interest in their country which in the last resort can command the supreme sacrifice. That these conditions have been completely changed since the adoption of Free Trade is disputed by no one. The consensus of opinion is, indeed, that Free Trade is directly responsible for the decline of agriculture and for the rush of the country people to the industrial centres. Certainly the interests of the agricultural population have for many years been subordinated to those of the people in the great cities. There has, it is true, been much legislation purporting to ameliorate the state of the rural population, and radical changes have been introduced into the system of land tenure. But while these changes have for the most part been concessions to the worst and most superficial of democratic prejudices, they have almost completely failed to check the depletion of the country districts. This could not have been otherwise, as both political parties have for long been agreed in rejecting any remedial measure which encroached in the slightest degree on the immediate and apparent interest of the industrial population.

But even those who have accepted as inevitable the concentration of the English people in industrial centres have had increasing misgivings as to the effect of this movement on national life. Whatever may have been the faults of the old land system, the man in the country in former days had a deeper conception of the value of national independence, a deeper sense of the common interest of all classes of society in its defence, than the modern artisan who lives in a tenement, and whose employer is often merely a board or syndicate, deprived for him of all individuality, and often recognising no responsibilities beyond those of a paymaster. For men such as this—wandering in times of industrial depression far from their families in search of employment—patriotism must be the most extraordinary rather than the commonest of virtues. If they are to be given a country to die for, if they are not to turn in despair to vain illusions of internationalism and crude socialistic imaginings, a number of positive changes and reforms are necessary in the conditions under which they live. Recognising this, many of the most stalwart Conservatives have welcomed the sane and practical social reforms which Mr. Chamberlain has been instrumental in carrying into effect. To them it is clear that it is necessary to adopt a more positive attitude towards such questions than that represented by Lord Hugh Cecil. Conservative opportunism, stirred to action only by an avowed anxiety 'to escape from some impending disaster or some worse legislative remedy,' must surely court the ridicule or the contempt of the electorate of to-day.

But there is an intermediate danger. Conversion to the necessity for positive reforms does not necessarily imply a realisation that an electorate transformed by successive extensions of the franchise and the provision of increased facilities for education—which one party has vied with the other in granting—is far less passive than formerly. An active electorate demands constant attention from party leaders; they must always keep in touch with public feeling, and every step they take—not only in connection with social reform—must be made clear and presented in its true light outside Parliament. It was this danger which the Unionist Government seemed to ignore after Mr. Chamberlain's resignation. In no instance was this more apparent than in the means by which it sanctioned the introduction of Chinese labour in the Transvaal.

A democratic electorate is as suspicious of capitalism as it is susceptible to its influence. That the success of the Johannesburg mines was essential to the prosperity of the Transvaal and South Africa, as a whole, could have been understood by everyone in this country. But the Liberals were quick to misrepresent, as a concession in favour of the capitalists, every measure by which Lord Milner endeavoured to increase the prosperity of the mining industry in the interests of the colony his genius was reconstructing. There was, of course, just that minimum of truth in this misrepresentation to make it dangerous; for, of course, the greater prosperity of the mines, however achieved, must bring increased benefits to the mineowners. It was, therefore, all the more necessary for the Unionist party to make it clear to the public at home that every one of these measures was necessary to the general welfare of the colony itself. In no case was this more imperative than in the daring experiment of Chinese labour. The Unionist Government was, of course, satisfied by Lord Milner that not only was Chinese labour the one practical solution of a difficult and pressing problem, but that the experiment had the approval of an overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the Transvaal. It was for the Government at home to decide how Lord Milner should obtain an expression of the popular feeling of the colony which would satisfy the electorate in this country that the introduction of the coolies was for the benefit of the whole colony in the first place, and not primarily for the benefit of the capitalists. The means by which such an expression of popular feeling was to be obtained at the moment was undoubtedly difficult to devise. That which the Unionist Government selected was precisely that most open to misrepresentation by the Liberals. It gave them the opportunity, which they were not likely to let slip, of pointing to the unfortunate fact that the Chinese Labour Ordinance was passed by a Legislative Council consisting of representatives of Johannesburg and official members nominated by the Unionist Government. It was useless to reply that this Council did contain a certain number

of Boers, and that, however constituted, it did undoubtedly in this matter ascertain and truly represent popular feeling. The Boer leaders had refused to accept nomination to this Council, and though they recognised the necessity of the introduction of the coolies, and raised no protest during the passing of the Ordinance, in pursuit of their own ulterior aims they endorsed the misrepresentations of the Liberals in this country. It is difficult to imagine any line of action by which the Unionist Government could have more successfully aroused democratic suspicions.

This is only one of several similar mistakes that characterised the tactics of the Unionist Government during the last two years of its existence, when democratic influences were removed from its councils. But it was certainly the most fatal in its results. It is interesting to speculate, from the significant data already at the disposal of the public, what shape the Chinese question would have taken if Mr. Chamberlain had remained in office.

The Unionist Government does not appear to have been aware of the suspicions it had aroused even when at last it went to the country. The tactics at the elections suffered from the same defects as its tactics when in power; for it is notorious that the Unionist leaders made no preparation for explaining their action with regard to Chinese labour during the elections. Those candidates who had made preparations of their own, without the support of the Central Organisation, proved that a very effective explanation could be given.

Heavy was the penalty that the Unionist party had to pay. The mischief did not stop here; for, in ignoring the democratic spirit of the electorate of the United Kingdom, the party had also ignored the democratic spirit of the wider Imperial constituency. And there is perhaps nothing which stirs so deeply the resentment of Imperialists against the Unionist Administration in its later stages; nothing about which it is so difficult to speak in the restrained language demanded by the present critical situation of the party; as the unmistakable evidence of the alienation of the Colonies which has resulted from the methods which it adopted in presenting the case—unanswerable in itself—for Chinese labour. To appreciate the extent of the mischief it is only necessary to read in some of the most Imperial of the Australasian newspapers the welcome which is accorded to the grant of responsible government in the Transvaal—a welcome based on the belief that a Boer majority will insist on the immediate repatriation of the Chinese. Before long the Boers will probably undeceive the Colonies and the British electorate; but this is obviously work which might with greater advantage have been undertaken by the Unionist Government itself. It is one of those grave personal injustices, which only history can set right, that Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner have, at any rate in the Colonies, to bear the onus of this

blunder. The only consolation for Unionists is in the thought that their tactics in connection with Chinese labour were not characterised by the immorality of the Liberal tactics; and they may safely predict that the Liberal party will suffer in the near future for the appeal to ignorance which it made in disseminating the 'slavery lie' and permitting the publication of the notorious Chinese posters. There are already signs of the commencement of that period of Liberal tribulation which must inevitably follow the awakening of the electorate to the deception which was practised upon it.

That the majority of the Unionist party is alive to the mistakes in its tactics is shown now that it has leisure to set its own house in order. Apart from, or rather underlying, all large problems of policy, such as the rival merits of Tariff Reform, Fiscal Reform, or Free Trade, is the question of the tactics of the party in Opposition, to the discussion of which Mr. Balfour has given an academic turn.

The one section contends that a party in Opposition should employ merely critical and destructive tactics; the other maintains that a constructive policy is the vital force of a party, and is more than ever essential when the party pulse is beating feebly. The academic argument in favour of critical and destructive tactics—based apparently on the assumption that when a party enters upon the stage of Opposition it starts without a record—is that the adoption of a constructive policy weakens the party in Opposition by exposing it to the criticism of the party in power; that the best means of drawing away from their allegiance those supporters who have given the party in power a majority is to direct attention to its blunders and to the defects in its policy by constant and vigorous criticism. This argument has great weight with those people who place party before everything, and see the needs of the nation only as refracted through party interests. It may be remarked in passing that such an argument displays a cynical indifference to national interests which brings the party system into disrepute among thoughtful persons, and is responsible for the undoubted increase in the number of so-called 'non-party' men. To such persons there is nothing more lamentable than the sight of an Opposition criticising a Government for those very defects which characterised its own tenure of office. To them it is evident that, if these tactics should succeed in returning the Opposition to power, there is no guarantee that its policy will be more efficient than that of the party which it has ousted. While these tactics appeal to those who deify their party, they are also obviously inseparable from Conservative opportunism as advocated by Lord Hugh Cecil.

The other section of the Unionist party pleads for tactics based on a constructive policy because, in the first place, it is under democratic influences, which always make for progress; and, secondly, because it is convinced that the present state of the Empire calls

for speedy reform, and that Imperialists must use every means at their disposal—not the least effective of which is public discussion in Parliament—to place before the electorate the constructive policy which they consider necessary to the achievement of that reform. Such tactics are, of course, fundamentally incompatible with the comfortable doctrine of *laisser faire*, even when dressed in the garb of Conservative opportunism. It is, therefore, not surprising that the division of the party on the question of its present tactics should correspond with its divisions on Tariff Reform.

The one section represents, at its best, the older Conservatism, to which the British Constitution and British institutions are sacred, but which does not hear the clamour from within, and is not sensible of the pressure from without, demanding that those institutions should be speedily adapted to the requirements of a modern world. The other section, imbued with the true spirit of Tory democracy, holds the British Constitution, British institutions, and British traditions no less dear; but it is convinced that individualism must give way to organisation on a democratic basis, if those institutions and traditions are to remain the foundations of an Empire which will raise England above the dangers of present decline. This conviction it has developed into a creed, for which it is prepared to make almost any sacrifices; believing that England's natural destiny is to be a partner, and for long the dominant State, in one of those great empires which, unless the future has unforeseen revolutions in store, will for long divide the civilised world among them.

That is the Imperialism which Mr. Chamberlain has taught to the present generation. It springs immediately from the Tory democracy of Lord Randolph Churchill, and both are in the direct line of succession to the policy of Mr. Disraeli.

Towards the close of the Earl of Beaconsfield's career Conservative opportunists recovered some of their lost influence. Lord Randolph then saved the party from being swept into a backwater of lost causes. Now, when Mr. Chamberlain has withdrawn temporarily from the political arena, it is natural that the opportunist influence should reassert itself. So strong is that influence at the present moment that there are some who think Lord Randolph's doleful prophecy has been fulfilled, and that Mr. Churchill and Lord Rosebery have pronounced the funeral orations of Tory democracy. If this is so, the future of Imperialism is to be sought in the growth of the Labour party, which will then have no difficulty in retaining the loyalty of the Tory working men whom it captured at the last election. Such a future is indeed dark; for, as far as anything can be foreseen, it is certain that Imperialism will not survive the war of class against class which this distribution of parties implies.

Conservative opportunists may not realise the true relation of Imperialism and democracy until it is too late—until the Empire

has dissolved into a number of independent States, swinging in their relations from extreme hostility to extreme intimacy under the influence of racial sentiment, the most wayward of all ties. But there will be a rude awakening for them when the democratic sentiment that they have ignored and refused to lead is, in its isolation in a Little England, demanding the confiscation of property. Then, perhaps, they will at last understand the unceasing efforts and the uncompromising attitude of those Conservatives and Unionists who believe to-day that this disaster can alone be averted by uniting all classes, in whom the democratic spirit really exists, in the promotion of social reforms, and by providing the means for carrying them out by a reform of the tariff, which will at the same time unite in a common interest the scattered democracies of the Empire.

FABIAN WARE.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH OUR LAND?

THE importance which the state of our land laws is assuming in contemporary politics, and the Bills passed or contemplated by the present Government, marking as they do the general trend of legislation with regard to agrarian matters, make it desirable to have a clear understanding of our agricultural problems and of the various remedies which have been proposed for their solution.

In order to secure this, it is absolutely necessary to have an exact knowledge of the existing conditions, which, judging from the discussions one hears and reads, is less general than might be supposed. For, important as its agricultural interests must be to any country, the number of individuals engaged in husbandry bears, in an industrial community such as ours, a comparatively small proportion to the mass of the population; and, though most people are ready to express an opinion on these subjects, it is surprising how few there are who do so with any adequate conception of the most elementary facts connected with the matter. This must be my excuse if in the following pages I restate facts well known to all people living on the land and of it, and which may seem to such too obvious to require comment or even mention.

At the present day the agricultural land of this country is mostly in the hands of private owners, who either cultivate it themselves or, in the majority of cases, let it to tenants at a fixed rent. Many people unacquainted with the subject seem to think that this rent, exacted by the landlord, is an arbitrary sum, which he can force up at his pleasure. As a matter of fact, it can only be altered within very narrow limits, being more or less fixed by economic laws, and though these have been set forth in various ways by different authorities, the underlying principle does not vary materially. John Stuart Mill, in his *Principles of Political Economy*, tells us that the worst land which can be cultivated under any circumstances must return enough to feed the labourer and replace the seed, and he goes on to say:

> The worse land which can be cultivated as an investment for capital is that which, after replacing the seed, not only feeds the agricultural labourers and their secondaries [the workmen who build their houses and produce their tools]

but affords them the current rate of wages, which may extend to much more than mere necessaries, and leaves for those who have advanced the wages of these two classes of labourers a surplus equal to the profit they could have expected from any other employment of their capital.

Whatever remains beyond this is

what the farmer can afford to pay as rent to the landlord; since, if he did not so pay it, he would receive more than the ordinary rate of profit. . . . No land, rented to a capitalist farmer, will permanently yield more than this, and when it yields less it is because the landlord foregoes a part of what, if he chose, he could obtain.

This (necessarily very much abridged) is the theory of rent as first laid down by Dr. Anderson at the end of the eighteenth century. It was practically rediscovered by Ricardo and since his time has been commented on and amplified by succeeding political economists, but its fundamental principles have remained unaltered.

In practice, however, landlords do not find it expedient to exact so much from their tenants as is indicated above, especially in cases where leases are granted, it being important that in bad years the tenant should not feel tempted to give up his holding, which he can nearly always do in fact, if not technically, and which would result in the landlord's having the farm thrown on his hands, at the very moment when it was most disadvantageous.

The fee simple value of land is usually taken at twenty-five years' purchase of the net rent; this is what the buyer, in ordinary cases, has to pay when purchasing an estate, though naturally the price may run either higher or lower, under any exceptional circumstances. We may therefore assume that in letting a farm to a tenant the landlord receives about 4 per cent. on his capital. Tenancies are either by the year or on a lease for a term of years, the former being most usual in England and the latter in Scotland; though it must not be imagined that our farming population is nomadic in its habits under one system more than the other—even in England the same families often occupy their farms from generation to generation, or if they change remain at any rate upon the same estate.

Out of his rents, the landlord has to pay the costs of management, also for the upkeep of the farms and his share of the taxes, this last a considerable item, land being more heavily taxed than any other form of property. On an estate large enough to be managed with economy, these various charges may possibly be reduced to between 1½ and 2 per cent., leaving the owner from 2 to 2½ per cent. on his capital. In cases, however, where the landlord does not himself superintend the management, or where, from any other cause, the expenditure is unduly heavy, his percentage of profit is apt to fall far below this figure. This expenditure does not include money spent on demesnes, shooting, or anything which may be considered personal to the landlord, merely what is spent for the benefit of the tenants.

Mr. Munro Ferguson, in a letter to the *Spectator* written some weeks ago, gives the figures for upkeep on two estates belonging to him. On one, producing a net rental of 4,995*l.* a year, 73,418*l.* has been spent since 1880, and on the other, with a net rental of 3,225*l.*, the total expenditure has been 71,093*l.* since 1882. These figures, though they will surprise no one conversant with the subject, may seem incredible to others, but they can easily be verified, and in fact there are few properties on which the total in fee simple value has not been expended, within the last three or four generations.

Were this money not so spent the returns from land would naturally diminish, and though the same amount, invested in other securities, might possibly more than make up for the consequent depreciation in rents, landlords who take an interest in their properties naturally prefer to spend it on them, as long as they can feel sure of the safety of the investment. The standard for buildings, &c., is thus raised, and all landlords have to follow suit, in order to secure tenants.

It will not surprise anyone, in face of these facts, to find that landlords, more than any other class, have been apt to find themselves in embarrassed circumstances. From whatever cause arising, these have, needless to say, reacted most unfavourably on their properties and their tenants; the case being generally much aggravated by the restrictions of the laws of entail, which constitute them, not the owners, but merely the life tenants of their property. These last gave rise to so many evils, one being the ruinous mortgages on many estates; and the right of what is called 'free alienation' was seen to be so important, in the interest of the land itself, that during the latter half of last century various laws were passed, facilitating the cutting off of entails on land. This was an undoubted boon, it being obviously better, when a landlord became too poor to maintain his estate, that he should have power to sell the whole or a part to someone better able to keep it up than he was himself. And, in spite of the poorness of the return, buyers could still be found; the supposed security of the investment, and the attractions of a country life, inducing men, not wholly engrossed by the business side of the question, to sink their money in what, from a commercial point of view, could at best be called an unprofitable venture. Later legislation, however, tending as it has done to increase more and more the burdens on land, the uncertainty as to where these exactions will stop, and the irresponsible statements sometimes made on public platforms, even by statesmen in responsible situations, concerning the position of the landed classes, have at the present time so shaken public confidence in the safety of any money invested in property that estates have once more become practically unsaleable. The seriousness of this to the country in general, and to the agricultural interest in particular, will be better appreciated as we go on; so it need not be enlarged on at present.

A farmer when renting a farm from a landlord requires a certain amount of capital. The land is supposed to be in good condition when he takes it; should it have been let down by the previous tenant, he expects a consideration to be made him in the rent. A dwelling-house and all necessary farm buildings, proportionate to the size of the farm, also drains and fencing, are provided by the landlord, who undertakes as well to keep all these in structural repair. Should the farmer at any time take more land, and in consequence require more house accommodation, he will expect the landlord to provide this also. These conditions might be expected to prove a fruitful source of disagreement between the two parties to the contract; it speaks well, however, for the working of the system that lawsuits between landlords and tenants are exceedingly rare.

Farmers as a rule prefer to get on to large estates. The reasons for this are obvious. On small ones, the landlord's margin of profit is so small that expenses must perforce be cut down as much as possible. Large landowners also, as a rule, take a good deal of pride in the condition of their tenantry, and it is a well-known fact that on many of the bigger properties, even under good estate management, the landlord's percentage on his capital is as low as 1 per cent. or less. As the same time there is a size beyond which it is not advisable to go; and in that case the land should be—indeed, it generally is—divided and put under separate managements.

The farmer's own capital is what is called the working capital of the farm, and out of it are provided the stock, seeds, manure, farm implements, &c. The amount required varies in different localities and depends also to a certain extent upon the nature of the farm; but about 7*l.* or 8*l.* per acre should suffice: for many parts of the country it would be excessive. This the farmer does not naturally expect to lose in the course of his tenancy: he rather looks to see it increase. Thus it will be seen that with a capital of 400*l.* a man can obtain the use of fifty acres of land, on which he can live in a degree of comfort far greater than he could secure by the employment of the same amount of money in any other venture.

Of all systems of land tenure that have ever been devised, this is the cheapest to the farmer and the most absolutely devoid of risk. As the reader has already seen, the owner's expenditure on his property varies from one third to one half of his income; the farmer, on the other hand, pays about 4 per cent. on the initial value of the farm. Of this he practically gets 1½ to 2 per cent. back again, for this is money he would have to spend himself on the farm, if it belonged to him; while in the case of buildings, &c., he probably gets much better value for the money spent than if he did what was necessary himself, as the large amount of work required on an estate enables great economies to be effected, and it is doubtful whether the farmers, even by co-operating among themselves, could get things done to so

much advantage. In the case of large drainage schemes, whereby whole districts have been made available for tillage, it is hard to see how otherwise they could be done at all.

It may of course be urged that the Government might undertake such an item as drainage; and of this method one can even now, to a certain extent, speak from experience. It has happened, in cases where a landlord was too embarrassed to undertake the work himself, that he has been forced to raise money from the Government for absolutely necessary improvements. Means are provided for this purpose. I have under my eyes at this moment the figures of one estate where upwards of 20,000*l.* was raised in this manner by the late owner. The work, principally drainage, was conducted under Government supervision and carried out in the most expensive manner: the repayments, as is usual in these cases, were spread over a number of years. These have constituted a very grievous burden on the present possessor, who has, besides, had the additional expense of having to do nearly the whole of the work over again, so badly was it carried out in the first instance. This of course is only one case, but similar experiences are not unknown on other properties, and there is no doubt that estates kept up under the supervision, and by the private enterprise, of the owner are better and more economically managed than by any other plan.

Before considering possible State schemes which might enable farmers to own their farms, or procure them at a cheaper rate, let us turn for a moment to the peasant proprietors of other countries and see how that system has answered with them.

The peasant proprietors of Denmark are admittedly among the most successful. A Scottish Agricultural Commission even thought it worth while to visit the country, for the purpose of drawing up a report on the subject. To this report I must refer the reader for details; it is not discouraging, and yet, what are the conclusions to which one is driven after reading it? In Denmark land is cheap and there is a considerable dairying industry—two conditions in themselves almost sufficient to insure the success of the small farmer. In spite of economy and good management, the farmers are mostly in debt; it is true that this is generally for the purchase money of their farms, for which they pay the Government from 4 to 5 per cent. Farm for farm, the standard of comfort is below what it is with us, and from inspection of their balance sheets it is evident that, even after the purchase money of their holdings is paid off, any additional sums required for new buildings, &c., will have again to be borrowed. On the smaller farms the profits amount to less than an average labourer can earn in this country.

The state of the peasant proprietors in France has of late been exciting much attention in that country, and French authors of eminence assert that the conditions of their lives are so hard as to

have completely changed the character of the agricultural population in the course of the last hundred years. Whether this is true or not, it is a fact that 'le paysan' is at present strikingly unlike the mass of his fellow-countrymen. Miserly, morose, suspicious; untiring industry and rigid economy are forced upon him by the exigencies of his position. Notwithstanding this, he is often hopelessly in debt, and his standard of comfort may be judged from the fact that in the year 1880, out of the nine million odd houses scattered all over France, upwards of two millions had only one window, or else no aperture save the door, and nearly four million others had only two windows or less. These statistics were taken for the purpose of levying the window tax, which I believe is still a source of revenue. The progress since then has been slow, and what strikes one most, on going into the farm-houses, is the very real poverty evident, even among the better class. Their food is neither so good nor so plentiful as that of our own farmers. Some of these evils no doubt arise from the extreme subdivision of the holdings. Twenty years ago it was calculated that 122,000,000 acres cultivated in France were already cut up into 127,000,000 small plots; and though, owing to the fact that one man is often the owner of several plots, the actual acreage per individual is not so small as might be supposed, still it is at best a very great inconvenience to the farmers, as their holdings, never extensive, often consist of pieces at a considerable distance apart. In 1881 when the situation had become acute, owing to competition from America, who since the year 1876 had been exporting corn to Europe in large quantities, France, following the example set her by Germany two years before, introduced corn laws, which, though trifling at first, were subsequently much increased. In some districts the peasants have abandoned the land, and there it is tending once again to get into the hands of large proprietors. M. Méline, late French Minister for Agriculture, has published a book on the *Return to the Land*, in which he describes the efforts made by the present Government to improve the position of the peasants.

In Savoy peasant proprietorship is the ruling condition. The Savoyards are a most attractive people, honest, kindly, and industrious. Their climate is good and their soil productive, yielding them three crops in the year. In my different visits to the country I always found the people full of interest. Their holdings were small and their lives seemed unduly hard. Two o'clock in the morning was a not unusual hour for them to rise; towards half-past three their carts, laden with market produce, used to come rumbling into the various country towns, and at eight o'clock in the evening they were generally still busy. All the crops were sold; they had not even the black bread of the French peasant for their own use. From the pulp of the chestnuts growing along the hedges, they made a kind of dough, which they ate instead of bread. They were hopelessly in debt. As

a very clever doctor, himself the son of a peasant and a native of the country, once said to me, 'It is the Jew in the country towns who owns the whole of Savoy.'

In Italy the results of the same system are equally discouraging. In the Neapolitan provinces alone, the Bank of Italy and the Bank of Naples held in 1902, through foreclosures of mortgages, landed property to the value of over two million pounds sterling.

In America, under what is called the 'Homestead Law,' any citizen of the United States having reached the age of twenty-one years, or any father of a family, is entitled to claim 160 acres of the public lands that have been surveyed but are not otherwise appropriated. His only expenses are the registration and other fees, but these are trifling. Notwithstanding these favourable conditions the small farmers in the Eastern States lead lives of poverty and are much in debt. In the Western States they do better, but this seems to be in cases where farmers have obtained sections on virgin soil, which they farm with the object of getting as much as possible out of the land and putting nothing back.

And now it may not be amiss to consider some of the schemes proposed for the improvement of our land system. Let us first take the idea of merely confiscating all land to the use of the State, without any compensation whatever to the owners, and using the revenues for the common good.

This idea, extravagant as it may sound, has been mooted in some quarters and possesses the merit of simplicity. The revenues from land, it has been stated, would constitute an enormous source of wealth, and ratepayers were asked to believe that any other taxes might become unnecessary. The revenues from land in Great Britain were estimated in 1906 at a little over 42,000,000*l*. Of this, as has been seen, from 14,000,000*l*. to 20,000,000*l*. are either paid in taxes or returned to the land by the present owners, so that, unless it was proposed to make the tenants heavy sufferers by the change, only upwards of 20,000,000*l*. would remain for the purpose of relieving the nation from other forms of taxation. Now, the national income during the last few years has averaged between 140 and 150 millions. The twenty-odd millions taken from the landlords would therefore not go so very far; it would not, as a matter of fact, even pay the interest on the National Debt. And for how long is it to be supposed that we should have these twenty millions? Is it not likely that the expenditure on estates, which, however heavy it may be, is now at any rate managed on the most economical plan by the owners in their own interest, would rise very greatly in the immediate future? Does not our experience of the way in which, for instance, the ratepayers' money is sometimes managed by our public bodies rather lead us to think that the wastage on this head alone might amount very shortly to at least 1 per cent.? And does it not seem also possible that the

extra expenses of collecting, supervising, &c., might come to at least 1 per cent. more? No one who knows the amount of supervision required on an estate, if it is to be kept up to a constant level of cultivation, and how very largely the personal factor enters into the at present mostly excellent relations between landlords and tenants, will consider this an excessive estimate. It is very safe to prophesy that, were the whole estates of the country to be confiscated to-morrow, before five years were over they would have to be run at a loss to the exchequer, and this, too, without conferring the smallest advantage on the tenants. Many properties are even now being run at a loss by the proprietors; this is very grievous for them, no doubt, but at any rate it is not being done at the expense of the ratepayers. As above outlined, this scheme takes no account of the large sums which have been lent on land, and which would have to be repaid by the State, unless it were proposed to defraud a very large number of people in addition to the landlords. Nor does it take account of the sums spent on their places, gardens, &c., by proprietors, all of which give employment to numbers of people.

Another idea put forward has been to despoil the landlord and make over his property to the tenant. The immediate result of this no doubt would be to benefit the present holders of farms. Most people would be benefited if they received a present equal to three or four times their existing capital. If we may judge from the experience afforded us by other countries, this is probably what would happen. The immediate standard of comfort would rise considerably. All would probably go well till buildings, &c., required renewing, then the farmer would borrow. He would not be able to get money under from 4 to 5 per cent., unless the Government were prepared to advance it at the expense of the ratepayers. It does not need much acumen to perceive that his liabilities would soon amount to more than his present rent. And future generations of farmers, how would they fare? If the reader will refer back to a previous paragraph he will see that under the present system a man with a capital of 400*l.* can take a farm of fifty acres. If instead of that he had to purchase the land from an outgoing tenant, it would cost him 1,650*l.* to establish himself upon the same holding.

No notice has yet been taken of the enormous shock to every other interest in the country, which would be the result of attacking the security of land; as an example of this, suffice it to say that the 'Agricultural Holdings Bill' alone, which has only just passed into law, has already caused the stoppage of all but the most absolutely necessary outlays on property—that is to say, shows a prospective loss to the farmers of something like 10,000,000*l.* for the coming year alone—and all classes of investors have been made so uneasy that large sums of money are being quietly withdrawn from every form of industrial enterprise and invested abroad. However, it is not likely

that anything so subversive of national interests as either of the above measures is seriously contemplated, but it is very possible that some measure may be introduced to enable farmers to buy their farms. If its provisions were such as not to outrage the national sense of equity there would be nothing to be said against such a scheme. It is very doubtful whether the State could advance the money at less than 4 per cent., but even so, though it would not improve the farmer's position from a pecuniary point of view, there is no doubt that the prospect of themselves owning their holdings would appeal to many, and among these such a measure would undoubtedly find a good deal of support. It must, however, be remembered that Government measures for interfering between private interests do not always command the success which the good intentions of their promoters deserve. The Crofters Act of 1883, for instance, excited a great deal of attention at the time, and was to do wonders for the people concerned. Proprietors who pointed out economic fallacies in the scheme were looked upon with a perhaps not unnatural suspicion. Since that time, in Orkney alone, two-thirds of the crofters benefited by the Act have applied to be relieved from its provisions and allowed to return under their former landlords.

When one considers all these facts it is forced upon one that it would be difficult to improve the condition of our farmers unless either their taxes, at present heavier than those of any other class excepting landowners, could be reduced, or unless they were enabled to get better prices for their produce, which last would also have the advantage of bringing once more into use the many thousands of acres which have gone out of cultivation all over the country owing to the impossibility of making them pay at the present values.

That farmers have existed so long without any form of protection, and that their status is still above what it would be in other countries, is due entirely to the unique conditions of their land tenure; in other words, to the existence of the landlord. It is rather the case of the latter which needs consideration. The various Governments (for the Conservatives have been in no way better than the Liberals), in trying to ameliorate the condition of agricultural tenants, have often done so without a sufficient appreciation of the exact state of things, and it has apparently been thought that the position of the farmer could go on being indefinitely improved at the expense of the landlord. The wisdom of this from an economical point of view we need not discuss here, though it must not be forgotten that uneconomical measures have sometimes a way of recoiling on the heads of the very people for whose benefit they have been devised, and it seems that this is what has already happened in this instance.

A large number of landowners are at this moment in very serious financial difficulties; they may be men to whom their tenants are much attached personally, but, needless to say, the farms on their

estates contrast unfavourably with those of less impecunious landlords. Under present conditions these properties cannot be sold, the State having at various times so harried proprietors that no one will if he can help it become a landlord. Thus the much-needed capital which would do more to put things right than a dozen Acts of Parliament, is prevented from flowing freely into the land by faulty if well-intentioned legislation.

And now, after all these facts, the question still remains, 'What shall we do with our land?'

The claim of landholders to the land is altogether subordinate to the policy of the State. The principle of property gives them no right to the land, but only right to compensation for whatever portion of their interest in the land it may be the policy of the State to deprive them of. To that their claim is indefeasible. It is due to landholders, and to owners of any property whatever recognised as such by the State, that they should not be deprived of it without receiving its pecuniary value. . . . This is due on the general principles on which property rests. Nor can it ever be necessary, for accomplishing an object by which the community altogether will gain, that a particular portion of the community should be immolated.[1]

Mill's theory of the rights of landowners, in as far as they are differentiated from those of other proprietors, is vitiated by the unsoundness of the premises on which he founded it. Still, the State is competent to expropriate the holders of any form of property, should it be necessary for the public good. Many battles are either lost or won before a single shot has been fired on either side. The traitor within the citadel has often been ready to open the gates before the fortress has even been called upon to surrender; but it is not so in this case. The landlord is absolutely convinced of his own integrity. He knows that he has bought his property over and over again. He is as well aware as any business man that, had he invested the amount spent on his land, even during the last thirty years, in other securities, he would probably have realised more than enough to make up for any consequent depreciation in his estates. Neither does he under-estimate the fact that the example set by him has done much to temper in this country the asperity of the struggle for mere wealth.

The most perfect social conditions must be the outcome of a gradual evolution; it is impossible to impose them on a people by Act of Parliament. I do not claim that any social conditions are yet perfect, far from it; but when we have destroyed, in a few short months or even years, a system which has been the outcome of nine centuries of continuous growth, we may find that we have nothing better, or even so good, to put in its place. And there is also another thing to be considered. When we have altered all the conditions of his tenure, we may still find that the farmer, overshadowed by the spectre of the big loaf, is no better off than he was before.

M. SALTOUN.

[1] *Principles of Political Economy*, J. S. Mill.

THE BIRTH-RATE AND THE MOTHER

THERE is no question which has received more attention or been the subject of more heated discussion recently than that known as 'The Decline of the Birth-rate.' Clergymen, economists, and statisticians have made eloquent and learned pronouncements upon it. Amid the hubbub there has been one not unimportant person whose point of view has been ignored—the mother.

It is a moral platitude that those who do what they believe to be wrong are self-condemned. What our spiritual mentors appear not to have grasped is that they are face to face with a new development of the mother's conscience, and the heart of the question is not touched by those who impute selfish motives as the only, or the general, or the chief cause of this almost universal development. I am not dealing here with the refusal of married women to become mothers at all. Except in unusual cases they are failing in their duty to themselves, to their husbands, and to society.

I can say from personal experience that a desire for limitation of family is at work through all classes of the English-speaking peoples, certainly among the more provident of all classes. It would indeed be surprising if the infallible guides along this new path were celibate or childless men like Father Bernard Vaughan, the Bishop of London, and Mr. Sidney Webb.

It may be true that if we examine carefully those 'superlative deceivers'—statistics, with reference to greater longevity we shall find that the real birth-rate has not declined at all, but that is not the real issue. Wanderings in Europe, the United States of America, and the British colonies have made it impossible for me to doubt that there is a real revolt amongst women against bearing as many children as their mothers and grandmothers bore. In the United States especially scarcely a stratum of society is unaffected by this sentiment. Mrs. Lydia K. Commander, writing in the American *Independent* about a year ago, showed as the result of exhaustive inquiries among medical practitioners and school officials that even the lowest classes of immigrants fresh from the slums and hovels of Eastern Europe begin to put a limit to their child-bearing as one of the first results of

their new environment. As soon as it is realised that better social conditions are within reach, restriction is adopted as one of the necessary means to attain them. Even in the conservative and far less sophisticated Southern States I found the same revolt. For the last four years my lot has been cast in South Africa—the least urban and least advanced of British colonies—and I must own to a feeling of great surprise when I found that not only in the long-settled districts but even among the white women resident in the native reserves the same feeling and the contingent precautions are widespread. Separated by weary treks from any centre of population, the licensed traders live on solitary stations four or five miles from their nearest neighbour, or at most in tiny townships of perhaps a dozen families, amid a swarming primitive race whose strict abstinence from limitation would presumably be held up by Father Vaughan and the Bishop of London as an example to Mayfair. Yet in the confidence of speech between woman and woman one hears the same ideal expressed—the restriction of the number of children within a limit consistent with the health and vigour of the women who bear them, and with the means of giving each child the best possible start in life. Such women are primitive enough in their isolation to be unaffected by the movements and ideals, vitiating or otherwise, of city life. A bride who has never seen a railway engine is no rarity. No sensible or even sane person is influenced by the prospect of an occasional twenty-mile ride for a waltz to the drone of a concertina. It is the ideal of wifehood and motherhood that has changed. The older generation was hard put to it to sign its name, kept no accounts, read nothing, and made up by gun-running and liquor-smuggling for the scanty gains of shiftless business methods. The younger generation sends its children to school, and the boys to distant colleges, heckles the politicians, and knows all about the London wool market. The older generation tended to find Kafir huts good enough for its purposes—and even Kafir women. The younger generation builds homes. Meantime the native swarms, the white man rules.

It is clear, then, that the phenomenon that has rightly come up for serious discussion should really be defined as a decline of the birth-rate in proportion to the marriage rate. Is it a good or a bad thing? If a good thing, is it wrong to adopt it as a conscious aim, and to will the means as well as the end? If it be urged that an absolute loss of population would be in itself an evil, it is a fact that no such loss can be proved, or even considered to be very probable. With rational regulation of births the survival rate of infants is raised, and ultimately the marriage rate—a topic I shall have to touch upon in another connection. But can we stop short when we have counted heads? Our question strikes its roots into all the deeper social movements of the day—individual development, education, the comradeship of husband and wife, provision for old age, the struggle

to meet keener competition, the higher value attached to health and life.

To a mother who is consciously aiming at ideals which may possibly be in their present form new, but which seem to her to be good, jeremiads will be addressed in vain by men who have not first done their utmost to remove some crying evils which society tolerates, and which affect her and her children very directly, and certainly lead to the loss of population. Are there no diseases preventible but not prevented? Is there no guilt on a society which allows the sale of injurious foods and still more poisonous patent medicines? Do notices of dismissal or writs of ejectment tarry on the way because there is an infant whose life is at stake? Have men who uphold the continuance of war any right to complain if women rebel against enduring without limit the discomforts and pangs of child-bearing and the long sacrifice of child-rearing to provide food for powder? Those who refuse to diminish the death-rate at the expense of their money-bags are not the ones to sit in judgment on women, even if women had no other motive in restriction than to lighten the burden of motherhood. No man with a spark of imagination or chivalry would wish to force upon the woman dearest to him unwilling motherhood.

The woman of to-day suffers more than her ancestors both in the anticipation and in the hour of child-birth—that is the price paid in nerves and physique for her more complete and sympathetic share in the work, the thoughts, and the fortunes of her husband and children, and for the training which makes it possible. Those who would not have it so declare their preference for the insensitive Kafir type. But from the entrance to civilisation *vestigia nulla retrorsum*. If child-bearing costs more, child-rearing costs infinitely more. The Kafir woman resigns herself to losing half the children born to her through carelessness or neglect or ignorance. The remainder are left to 'grow,' like Topsy. But the white woman agonises over her child. The more intelligent she is, the more she knows of child life and hygiene, the more ambitious of the best, the intenser grow her cares and anxieties. And the higher the type of children, the more difficult to rear, for the higher type of brain takes more than its fair share of nourishment. If, through having too many children, when the mother has 'grown dead sick of children,' she fails in her duty to the later comers, she suffers pangs of remorse which the husband who is only anxious to have 'the brats kept out of his way' cannot understand. What opportunity for wise upbringing had a woman I know, on whom fell the housework and a fair share of shop-work and stock-tending, and who for twenty years was either carrying or nursing a babe? 'Do you think,' she asked me one day, 'that if I had known how to prevent it I would have had fifteen children?'

'The curse of Eve' is a phrase that one hears drop glibly from the pulpit. Is it for men to press the curse on women so remorse-

lessly as to give them no mitigation? Could any man do so who realised his debt to mother, sister, nurse? The Divine recompense is the gift of a little leisure to enjoy the growth and development of the lovely little creatures they have gone to death's door to bring forth into life. And is the demand for this to be cheaply sneered at as the whim of the fashionable and frivolous? When Nature wants a school of fish she spawns a million. When she wants a few thousand rabbits she produces large families at intervals of a few weeks, of which, perhaps, 10 per cent. survive. To make certain of one hundred Kafirs she produces two hundred. But the modern mother, who knows that the want of individual care is the modern Herod, revolts from a theology which palliates such slaughter of the innocents. As we ascend in the scale of the nations motherhood grows keener and tenderer, and the mother's joy in the life of her little ones is the measure of her grief in their death. Amongst us the loss of a child has become one of the world's tragedies, and scars the mother's heart beyond the healing power of years.

Practically all the women of our race are capable of this passionate and lasting love, which carries with it the most devoted care, though evil social conditions and too many calls on this devotion may weaken and exhaust it.

A short while ago *Pearson's Magazine* contained some striking articles on the enormous number of needless deaths among infants in the British Isles. It is practically certain that with a smaller number of births the proportion of deaths would be less. The mother of too many children, whether in the richer classes or more particularly in the working classes and among colonists, has neither the strength nor the ability to attend properly to them all. The race of good nurses other than the mother herself is almost extinct. No mother who does not supervise the nursery herself, however rich she may be, can be certain that her children are properly cared for. In the case of colonists, living, like the South Africans, amid a lower race, too large a family is fatal to the character of the white race, for, except in the case of very well-to-do parents, the children just above the baby must be left almost entirely to the care of coloured girls who are neither enlightened nor moral, or to natives still lower in the scale of humanity. Many a child in the native reserves can speak no language but Kafir, and only those who understand that language can gauge the fetid vocabulary which they learn to syllable before they learn to understand. In England nowadays women must supervise the work of house, shop, farm, and garden, and the two or three children that they can rear in good principles by careful training are of far more worth as Empire-builders than a swarm of children tainted by too close contact with a lower race, or, in England, left to the tender mercies of possibly careless hirelings.

Though possibly the power of nursing has decreased, the potential

fertility of women in civilised society seems to increase. It is certain that it far exceeds the capacity for wise and careful rearing. In hot climates such as that of India or South Africa a mother could bear ten children in as many years if she survived so long. Yet Father Bernard Vaughan unsparingly condemns even the regulation of the interval between births! He can never have realised the mother's anguish who knows that her little ones have come too closely on each other's heels to have the vitality they require for a healthy life. He who speaks lightly of the hand that rocks the cradle emptying it of one baby for a fresh one can never have heard the wailing of the dispossessed babe deprived of its mother's first care and attention, or seen the mother's tears drop on the ailing and puling infant who has taken all her strength and yet has so little for itself.

It is significant of much of the truth of this matter that the men who most readily recognise the necessity of regulation are those who are most attached to wife and weans. The struggle for life grows harder, and few can discuss the question, as Father Vaughan's father did with him, on broad acres that have passed by inheritance through many generations. The increasing 'mobility of labour' is an element of the difficulty of rearing large families, and one that specially burdens the mother. Few Englishmen are secure from the call to travel to 'some distant sun,' which may not be a healthy sun. It would seem a commonplace that the question must differ from what it was when our grandfathers seldom moved from the parish in which they were born. However healthy the children, there are anxieties and heavy costs. If the children are unhealthy, that is a story you may read in ruined nerves and premature grey hairs. Instead of a spiritual equivalent for the old Poor Law, which set a premium on the number of children, we need a premium on the quality of the children. Even at home, do not the hospitals and asylums, for those who through weakness of moral or physical constitution fail in the terrific modern struggle for existence, cost as much as the ratepayers like to pay? The 'mob that owns only personal property' does well to think long thoughts.

Nothing but the regulation of the number of children can make early marriage possible. Here we come upon the fact that under a system of restriction the increase of the marriage rate will help to balance the decline of the birth-rate per mother. If ten women marry and each has three children there will be as many births as if five marry and each has six. Not only so, but early marriage is the solution of most promise in dealing with one great problem which is not often discussed as part of the question of matrimony, but which never ought to be discussed apart from it. The Western races rightly set an ever-increasing value on the chastity and fidelity of the man and the husband. The man who has climbed out of promiscuity, open or secret, has more capacity for good than he who has not. He

is on the up-grade. He who does anything to postpone the age of marriage, or to make marriage less attractive or less compassable, is pushing back the climber into the slough. I say no word against celibacy for exceptional men who have felt a call to it. But Tolstoy in *The Kreutzer Sonata* has drawn a vivid picture of the morbid effects of the celibacy of the married. The average man feels no call to celibacy, and recognises the force of the second of the 'causes' of matrimony set forth in the Anglican ceremony. This cause surely still operates, even if a couple decide that for a time, or for always, they have had as many children as they can rightly bring up; or that the wife can bear without that shrinking horror and fear which we realise increasingly, as every year adds to our knowledge of the influence of pre-natal conditions, must leave a disabling impress on the unborn child.

Our spiritual advisers should look the fact squarely in the face that all their denunciations will not lessen the reluctance of women under changed conditions of society to bear large numbers of children, and that their condemnation of restriction is simply a denial of their pronouncement 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'

It is not only unwise but false to say, as Father Vaughan does, that in a marriage in which restriction of family is deliberate, the husband and wife have lost all respect for each other. Rather by continued 'mutual society, help, and comfort' they grow to be closer comrades, more one in heart and aim. Their children are a bond of union such as they can never be when their advent has been against the will and conscience of the mother. The ideal of the family as the foundation of society is thus worthily upheld. On the other hand, is it not horribly true that when such causes as we have referred to sap the foundation of society, and society does nothing to lighten the burden the foundation has to bear, the structure comes to rest more and more on those whom Socrates called its pillars? Are we to strengthen the foundation, or to multiply the pillars?

I need hardly say that I am fully aware that the withholding of recognition by the medical profession and society generally that the mother's claim is right within proper limits is producing great evils. If the doctor passes by on the other side, the quack is always at hand. Father Vaughan's hearer who 'refused to add greatly to his income by giving such advice,' could have saved much suffering by a few minutes' conversation. The recent jeremiads will tend to prolong such evils, and on that ground call for protest.

It is quite unlikely that in this matter the conscience of the race will reject as evil means advisedly adopted to attain an aim which commends itself as good. A few years ago it was the use of anæsthetics at child-birth that was denounced as an avoidance of the curse of Eve. How hopelessly unchivalrous Adam has always been

about that unrejected apple! Even the Boer Predikants rarely thunder now against the destruction of locusts because locusts are a scourge of God. The untheological mind cannot reconcile itself to the theory that God sends the scourges while the Devil sends the antidotes and gives us the brains to discover and apply them.

IRENÈ M. ASHBY MACFADYEN.

ENGLISH ORAL TRADITION

I HAVE spent more than three years travelling about in England, as an American clergyman, and have taken duty—for longer or shorter periods—in almost every diocese.

In every parish I have visited, when time would permit, I have made a point of looking up the local oral traditions. There are very few written traditions, and these are, as a rule, cooked up more or less, and are therefore devoid of real interest and value. The difficult thing, of course, is to get the tradition at first hand; that is, in the regular channel of oral communication without any intermediary. For you cannot trust the parson or the doctor or any other educated man who may live in the village to tell you the exact truth about any tradition. And the strange thing is that these educated people may live in the midst of the most interesting traditions for a lifetime without knowing anything about them. The farmer is the most likely person to put you on the right scent, but even he is not wholly trustworthy. It is to the plain, ignorant, stupid agricultural labourer, and to the equally ignorant village tinker and mechanic that you must go for the direct and authentic line of tradition. And this is a most delicate business, for it is the nature of these shy folk to give you what you want, and it is astonishing what plausible stories they can improvise. In fact, they will be able usually to accommodate you with any kind of tradition you require; that is, if you, by your questions, give them any kind of a lead. You must therefore use indirection, must dissemble your real purpose and approach your subject in a way that will arouse no suspicion in the rustic mind that you are on the hunt for traditions. Above all, you must avoid, as far as possible, asking questions; for, however skilfully disguised, they are almost certain to give you away. The parson has more and better chances for discovering the true local traditions than anyone else, for the reason that he can, if he be gifted with tact, cover his visits with a multitude of plausible pretences. The important thing is to get your man—it is always a man, women are too garrulous to repeat what they have heard without giving their own emendations and glosses—to talk, for this is the surest way to establish friendly relations with him. Any subject almost will serve your purpose, especially anything relating to the parish, the village, or the graveyard. For the most

interesting and valuable bits of tradition are hidden away in the most unexpected holes and corners of the rustic mind, and drop out suddenly like pure nuggets of gold from some dull, hard, unpromising lump of quartz. There is a small round hole in a pane of glass in one of the windows of the room where I am at this moment writing. I felt certain the hole had been made by a bullet, but I had inhabited the apartment for nearly two months without asking any questions about it. This is in the town of Cricklade, Wiltshire, near the Gloucestershire border. It is situated on the banks of the Thames near 'Thames Head,' 'and is of great antiquity,' to quote from *Kelly's Directory*. In fact, the greatness of its antiquity no man knoweth, for it reaches back to 'Brutus, who with his warlike Trojans took possession of the Island of Albion, and planted a Colony of Greek Philosophers on this spot and called it "Grekelade."' However true or false this may be, there is no doubt about the ancient character of the town, and that it is the site of the first University ever established in England. Moreover, it is claimed that to this foundation Oxford University owes its origin. Of course, the Benedictines had a settlement here. The town now consists for the most part of one long, wide, irregular street, in which a market is held once a month, when cattle, sheep, and pigs are to be seen rounded up in front of every door from one end of the town to the other. And occasionally an adventurous cow, steer, or pig bursts into the very bosom of a family circle. The house in which I am now lodged is at the north end of the town, where the street suddenly widens into a sort of public square. This square is occupied on certain festival days with merry-go-rounds, shooting galleries, cocoa-nut alleys, and the like national sports, from which the town receives a small revenue. I asked my landlady the other day if these sports were not a source of some annoyance. She waxed very hot in answering my question, and said they were not only a great nuisance, but a great danger, and, pointing to the small round hole in the window-pane, said that was done last Michaelmas by a bullet from a shooting-gallery just in front of the house. "'But I should think you could stop that sort of thing?' I said. 'No,' she replied, 'these people have the right to the use of the open space by the payment of a small licence, and no one can prevent them, and we must take the risk and prosecute them individually for any damage they may do. That is what the police inspector says. But you can't get anything out of such vagabonds. Still, I think I know a way to prevent them coming here any more. I and my husband were both born in this town, and anyone born in Cricklade has the right to sell any proper merchandise in the streets of any town in England and Wales without licence, and we and Captain K—— (their next-door neighbour) are going to cover the square with tables during these festivals on the pretence of selling things. Of course, we shall have to offer something for sale.' 'How did the natives of Cricklade come by this special

privilege?' I inquired. 'It was given by royal grant to the natives of this town, because Cricklade gave refuge to a queen in distress.' I was not and have not been able to learn either the name of the queen or the nature of her distress; but this gave me a scent which I have followed pretty closely, and while I have learned nothing more concerning the incident itself—for the clergy, the doctor, the squire, and all the other members of the gentry were wholly ignorant of the tradition, had in fact never heard of it before, yet—and this is the interesting feature—I have made sufficient investigation to learn that this merely oral tradition, hundreds of years old and without any documentary evidence to support it, will, if evoked, hold good to-day, at least in Cricklade, and my landlady's citizenship will stand her in good stead. This oral tradition is therefore at least of some real value to her, whether true or false. That it is true I have not the slightest doubt, and I offer the following explanation for what it is worth. There is a farmhouse in this town, which I can look upon from my back window, that has always, time out of mind, supported the lordly name of 'Abington Court.' When or why this grand name was given to a mere farmhouse, and, as at present seen, a very ordinary one at that, no one here seems to know, or to be curious about. The present family have occupied it for more than sixty years as tenant farmers. The house and a large portion of the farm are beautifully situated on the south side of the winding Thames. Now, there is not only tradition but documentary proof that here in Cricklade was at one time a royal hunting-box, and that Charles the Second was the last sovereign to occupy it. 'Abington Court' figures in the Court records of those times, and the site of this farmhouse would have certainly been the most desirable spot in this neighbourhood, and for miles around, for a royal seat. This fact of itself, together with the name 'Abington Court,' which has always been associated with the place, is worth something in an argument which endeavours to establish the ancient site of the royal residence. But 'Abington Court' boasts of a royal bedstead, which I have seen, and in which I implicitly believe. It is a large four-posted solid oak bedstead, with a heavy oak covering, or 'canopy,' if this word can be properly made to apply to material so substantial. The head board is high, reaching in fact to the top, and is very elaborately and artistically carved, as is also the canopy and the posts. The footboard is lost. This bedstead has always belonged to this farmhouse—Abington Court, as it is called. I made an offer to purchase it, but was told by the farmer that it was a part of the estate and could not be alienated. 'Was there any writing to that effect?' I asked. 'No, but it was quite well understood,' was the answer. This is all mere tradition, but when taken together with all the other circumstances—with the beautiful situation on the Thames, the princely name, and the historical fact of the royal hunting-box—it furnishes almost the last necessary link in a pretty strong chain of

evidence that goes to show that 'Abington Court' was once a royal abode. If, then, this chain hangs together, without much tinkering, as I believe it does, we have established our major premise, namely, that Abington Court was once a royal seat. That much we shall now at any rate assume as proved, and from this it is not a very wide nor wild leap to the conclusion that once upon a time a queen gave birth to a child in the town of Cricklade. And this I take to be the meaning of the tradition that this town gave refuge to a queen in distress, and that this interesting event caused the king to decree that all the native citizens of this place should be for ever at liberty to sell, without licence, any and all articles of merchandise throughout England and Wales. Moreover, I have come upon some small traces of a tradition that the royal bedstead was left behind when the Court took its final departure, as a most appropriate gift to the citizens of the town in which a royal accouchement had taken place. 'I may be guilty of a little innocent cooking of facts in the explanation I have given of this interesting local tradition, but I am wholly unconscious of any disposition to do so, and I fearlessly stake my reputation as an antiquarian (which I am not) upon the issue. At any rate, here we have a local oral tradition that has outrun all written records, and has nothing but the word of mouth of the most ignorant members of the community to support it, and yet when this tradition is evoked it retains, even to-day, the character and force of statutory law. The fact that not one of the 'gentry' of Cricklade, so far as I know, had ever heard of this tradition is very remarkable, but is in perfect character with the unconscious methods by which these country traditions are perpetuated from generation to generation.

But I have now to relate a still more remarkable example of the secret manner, conscious or unconscious, in which these traditions are held and passed on by the peasants. I told my story of the royal grant in favour of the citizens of Cricklade to Mr. Charles Beadon, of 'Upcott,' in the adjoining parish of Latton, and he quickly gave me a Roland for my Oliver. I give Mr. Beadon's story substantially as he told it to me. 'A few years ago a labourer was working in Mr. Beadon's garden under his immediate supervision, and *à propos* of nothing that he can remember this man remarked that a certain stream near by, called the 'Lertoll Stream,' was good for the eyes, and that people used to carry this water away to bathe their eyes with. This was all the rustic knew, and therefore was all he would say. A more intelligent and romantic individual would have garnished this simple story with a border of some kind. But poor Hodge had not the wit to do that, and without adding or subtracting he passed on the tradition just as his forebears had done all these centuries. Mr. Beadon is a native of the village, and his uncle, the late Canon Beadon, was for fifty-three

years the vicar of this parish, and yet this was the first time that any member of the family had ever heard of such a ridiculous superstition, and he naturally gave it little or no thought. A year or so after this trifling incident, the present vicar of the parish came in to see Mr. Beadon, and asked him if he had ever heard anything about a spring behind the 'Oak Barn,' called the 'Lertoll Well,' from which the stream of that name is supposed to flow, and if there was any tradition in the parish that this water was good for the eyes. The vicar said he asked these questions because he had just received a letter from the Bishop of Bristol inquiring if he had ever come upon such a tradition in the parish. Mr. Beadon then made known for the first time the story of the agricultural labourer, and this peasant was the humble instrument of enabling the Bishop—who is a well-known antiquarian scholar, to trace the story of the 'oak tree'—under which St. Augustine held his famous conference with the native British clergy—to this 'Oak Barn.' Here the historical 'oak tree' once stood, and from under its branches a spring of water issued, with which the saint healed the blind. The historical incident known to the bishop and scholar gave the fact of the conference, the oak tree, and the reported healing; the oral tradition furnished by the rustic identified the place, and confirmed, in a most unintentional and ingenuous manner, the whole story of the famous conference. So that the Oak Barn in the parish of Down Ampney, not more than two miles from where I write, has now been with reasonable probability identified with St. Augustine's 'oak tree,' through the casual word of a peasant dropped between the intervals of digging in Mr. Beadon's garden. But to me the most interesting part of this remarkable story is the amazing fact that Mr. Beadon's family have lived not one mile distant from the 'Oak Barn' for at least sixty years, and still he had never heard of this tradition concerning the healing qualities of the 'Lertoll Stream,' and yet it has been passing from mouth to mouth among the humble and ignorant folk of this parish for thirteen centuries. The Venerable Bede mentions in his account of St. Augustine's conference with the native British clergy the circumstance that after the conference the saint healed a man's eyes by prayer, and—tradition adds—by bathing them with water from a spring hard by. I cannot at the moment verify this very free quotation from Bede, but I think it is substantially correct, and I leave it thus.

I spent six months as the *locum tenens* of a remote Norfolk country parish. My next-door neighbour, a widow lady, had married into one of the few yeoman families who still live on their own land. This was a very ancient family. My neighbour and I became very good friends, and held almost daily converse with each other.

'How is it,' I asked her one day, 'that the villagers never by any chance pronounce your name as you do?'

'It is sheer stupidity mixed with stubbornness,' she replied.

'But have they always pronounced your name wrongly, for they seem to spell it correctly?'

'Yes; they have always persisted in spelling it one way and pronouncing it another. But the Norfolk villager is noted for his rude and ignorant independence, as it is called.'

But I did not feel so sure that this would account for a habit of speech among the peasantry which was both universal and immemorial, so far as I could learn, and I thought it a matter worth investigating. I asked several villagers why they did not pronounce this lady's name as she did, and as it was spelt. But they could give no answer, the only reply being that their fathers and mothers had always pronounced the name as they did. So I did not get very far in my investigation, till one day, in passing through a village some eight miles distant, I found that it bore the name of my yeoman family. This at once arrested my progress, and, dismounting, and giving my horse a rest, I spent several hours walking about talking with the villagers. I found that they all pronounced the name just as our own village folk did, and that in spite of the spelling to the contrary. I became very much interested, and I asked to see the church records. But this was rather difficult, as the incumbent was absent. However, I finally induced the clerk to show me the books. The records of this parish went back to the fifteenth century, and I discovered that the name I was in search of was spelt first one way and then the other, till I came to the seventeenth century—my examination went backward from the nineteenth—when it was uniformly spelt as the village folk now pronounced it. This was indeed a most important discovery, and proved in a striking manner that the peasant folk had perpetuated by word of mouth the correct original name of this ancient family, whilst the family itself had lost it. This I regard as a very remarkable instance of the purity and persistence of oral tradition in the very face of the incorrect written word, proving, as I have always held, that tradition is more trustworthy than history so called.

On my return home I greeted my neighbour by her correct traditional name, and remarked that the villagers were, not so stupid, but were perhaps even more stubborn than she had suspected. She was greatly interested in the results of my antiquarian research, but pretended not to be convinced, and always smiled when I greeted her—as I did ever after—by the correct ancient family name.

Not many months ago, during a somewhat heated discussion in the smoke-room of a West End club, the following old saw was given as a perfect example of false logic: 'Tenterden steeple was the cause of the Goodwin Sands.' But I contended that on the contrary this was an example both of good logic and the persistency and value of oral tradition. My intervention in the discussion was laughed at by a

room full of university men, many of whom were well-known authors; and I stood there for some ten minutes quite alone contending against this brilliant company of Britons.

'But he laughs best who laughs last,' and I stuck to my thesis, intimating, as politely as I could, that it was pure ignorance which caused their merriment. I then gave the following account of this classic example of false logic: When the encroachment of the shoals called the Goodwin Sands began to be dangerous to navigation, there was some sort of a commission appointed to investigate the matter, and if possible to ascertain the cause. Many expert witnesses had been heard when a common sailor took the stand and said he had always understood that Tenterden steeple was the cause of the Goodwin Sands. Of course, he was laughed at for his pains by the wise and learned commission, and his testimony has served to amuse the knowing ones for many generations. But a little knowledge of the local tradition of Tenterden confirms the testimony of the poor ignorant sailor and turns the laugh at last upon the commission. A sum of money had been left by an enterprising citizen of the parish of Tenterden to keep the Goodwin Sands from encroaching upon the Channel. This money was honestly applied for some time, how long is not known, and the shoals were kept clear. But the time came when these funds were diverted from their rightful purpose, and were misapplied for the erection of a steeple on the parish church. The sands were thus left to accumulate, and hence the very truthful, as well as logical, saying of the people that Tenterden steeple was the cause of the Goodwin Sands. Here we have a perfect bit of logic, containing a very interesting and valuable historical incident, wrapped up in a traditional nutshell—which has been handed on from generation to generation by word of mouth.

'But where is Tenterden steeple? It is nowhere near the Goodwin Sands,' exclaimed several of my literary auditors at once; and I then had to supplement my lecture on the persistency and value of English oral tradition with a short discourse on English geography, explaining that there was a time—strange as it might seem to these highly literary gentlemen—when Tenterden steeple was nearer the coast than it is to-day.

The Mayor of Canterbury writing to the *Times* only the other day, in answer to a letter of Sir W. B. Richmond concerning the alarming condition of the cathedral tower, states that 'The Mayor and commonalty, as a body corporate, are no more responsible for the present condition of the cathedral tower than are the Goodwin Sands for that of Tenterden church steeple.' The Mayor in his quotation of this old maxim has got it wrong end first, but his meaning is clear enough, and he has unwittingly evoked an example which is fatal to his arguments, for if the municipality of Canterbury is no less as well as no more responsible for the decay of the cathedral tower than Tenterden

steeple was for the accumulation of the Goodwin Sands, then it is wholly responsible.

The ecclesiastical parish of Chipperfield—where I acted as *locum tenens* for nearly a year—lies for the most part within the manor of King's Langley. This was once a royal manor, and some remains of the royal manor-house are still to be seen on the top of Langley Hill. There is also a royal tomb in Langley church, and there is a tradition, which is acted upon to this day, that the lord or lady of the manor has the special privilege of raising the Royal Standard on all national festive days. All these things have, as it were, clothed King's Langley parish with an atmosphere of royalty. Now, among the traditions, there is one to the effect that during the royal residence at this manor-house there was a decree passed that the widows of the village of Chipperfield in the manor of King's Langley should not be allowed the usual dowry from their husband's estates, be they large or small. That some of the villagers believe this law to be still in force is shown by the following incident. The late lord of the manor, a few years ago, was condoling with a widow who had just lost her husband, when the old crone greatly surprised him by saying, 'Yes, sir, it is hard, but the worst is, I can't keep any of his things if his children' (who were also her own) 'wants to take them.' 'But why not?' asked the lord of the manor. 'Why, sir, don't you know there is a law that no woman in Chipperfield can claim anything that belonged to her husband?'

'I know there is an idle tradition to that effect, but it has never been a law so far as I know. But what makes you think there is such a law?' 'Well, sir' (I give the substance of her words), 'I have always heard that once there was a king with a hunchback, who came to see our beautiful Chipperfield Common. The women of the village all turned out to see his Majesty, and when they saw his hunchback they all laughed at him. This made the king very angry, and he then and there decreed that no Chipperfield woman should ever inherit a dowry from her husband.'

The lord of the manor had lived at least for sixty years in Chipperfield, and, whilst he was familiar with this tradition, he had never before heard anything about the special circumstances connected with the origin of this royal decree. And yet this very picturesque bit of history—for history it appears to be—had been passing for five centuries, by word of mouth, from one generation to another, and from one villager to another. Could anything better illustrate the unintentional secrecy and persistency of English oral tradition?

The story of a visit to Chipperfield by a hunchback king is strangely corroborated by the fact that Richard the Third was at least once in residence (between the years 1483–85) at King's Langley manor.

A curious and amusing instance of the way family reputations are sometimes perpetuated by oral traditions came under my notice in an

ancient Lincolnshire country parish. I was talking one day with my cook about the various families in the parish, when in the course of our gossip the name of a very old county family became the subject of comment. Speaking of the lady who was the present head of this family, my cook said: 'She be mighty good to the people, she be; but she do like her own way, she do, and she be dreadful hard on the young people. But they do say that her own young ladies' (they were all married) 'be a bit wild.'

'What do you mean?' I asked.

'No harm, I am sure, sir, only they do say as how one of the young ladies fell into the dyke stream at the end of the first field as you goes to the cricket ground, and that she was taken out with her long beautiful hair all down and wet by a young gentleman what was a *readin' with the rector, sir.*'

'I don't understand.'

'Well, sir, it was like this, sir. You know the rectory field' (I was living in the rectory house) 'and the manor field both go down together to the dyke side by side like. Well, sir, the rector he had a young gentleman a-readin' with him for the University, and him and my lady used to meet each other o' nights at the Dyke Bridge. And the way they was found out was because my lady fell into the dyke one dark night, and the young gentleman had to pull her out and take her home all wet and drabbled like, with her long hair a-hanging down, and they do say it reached nearly to the ground. And that's how it all comes out at last that they were a-making love with each other, sir.'

'When did this happen?' I inquired.

'Oh, I don't know that, sir.'

'Did you know this young lady?'

'Oh no, sir.'

On further investigation, and on making inquiry of the lady of the manor herself, I found that this clandestine and very romantic meeting between the man and the maid had been the talk of the parish for more than a hundred years, and had given a reputation for wildness to the daughters of this family during all these years. Which is another proof of the persistency and truthfulness of English oral traditions, and, as I remarked to the lady of the manor, the continuity of character, to which latter, however, she demurred.

It is in these quiet and remote places and by the most simple and unpremeditated methods, that the oral traditions of England are handed on from generation to generation. Written records kill them, as does also too much knowledge. But knowledge, at least in the sense of reading and writing can no longer be kept away from the peasants, so that now is the time to take stock of these most interesting and valuable traditions which are hidden away in the remote corners of the rustic mind all over England; and I fear that in another generation they will have been lost for ever.

I feel sure that almost every country parish in England contains some interesting and valuable local oral tradition, if one but knew how to get on the scent of it, however trivial it may seem. The smart up-to-date destructive critic often talks more nonsense than the ignorant local story-tellers in the old Anglo-Saxon villages, where they still keep the 'veast' by old reckoning, a fortnight behind the date of national festivals as given in the modern almanack.

G. Monroe Royce.

MACBETH ON THE STAGE

'NOVEMBER 5th, 1664.—To the Duke's house to see *Macbeth*, a pretty good play, but admirably acted.' This is Pepys's first entry in his diary, as it records his first impression, in the character of an assiduous and critically-minded playgoer, concerning *Macbeth*. Two years later, on the 28th of December 1666, he saw it again at 'the Duke's house,' and then found it not only, as before, 'most excellently acted,' but moreover 'a most excellent play for variety.' Here was a decided increase on his first faint admiration, but after a much shorter interval appreciation of the play grew greatly upon him. On the 6th of December 1667 he wrote:

> To the Duke's house, and saw *Macbeth*, which, though I saw it lately, yet appears a most excellent play in all respects, but especially in divertisement, though it be a deep tragedy; which is a strange perfection in a tragedy, it being most proper here, and suitable.

It would be highly interesting to know why the diarist thought that relief to tragedy was particularly appropriate in *Macbeth*, and also exactly what scenes or incidents he included in the term 'divertisement.' There was a vein of pleasant childlikeness in him which would doubtless have delighted in the entry of Macbeth and Banquo on horseback, which was noted by Doctor Simon Forman in the early production of the play, and may have been preserved as traditional business; there was the Porter's scene; there were the Witches, and, one may suppose, the songs in their scenes (iii. 5 and iv. 1) due, as Mr. Sidney Lee and others hold, probably to Middleton, and interpolated by the players after the first production. However that may be, Pepys was sufficiently impressed by the play to pay it two more recorded visits, concerning one of which (October 16, 1667) he noted that he was 'vexed to see Young (who is but a bad actor at best) act Macbeth, in the room of Betterton, who, poor man! is sick.' Clearly this 'deep tragedy' was a favourite piece not only, after his first impression, with Pepys, but also with the general run of audiences, as it has always continued to be. Apart from its deeper interests there is an obvious reason for this in the ding-dong swiftness of action, unusual in Shakespeare, and variety, despite similarity, in situation

that have been noted by all commentators, including Doctor Johnson, who, however, held also the strange opinion that the play had 'no nice discriminations of character; the events are too great to admit the influence of particular dispositions, and the course of the action necessarily determines the conduct of the agents.' The constant popularity of *Macbeth* as a stage play accounts for the numerous oddities or 'divertisements' extant with regard to it in stage history and stage story, as well as for the many forms of tampering and tinkering it has undergone. The craze for bettering Shakespeare is indeed not far remote from the passion for squaring the circle or discovering a mechanical method of perpetual motion. Even Goethe proposed for the Weimar Theatre an 'improvement' on *Romeo and Juliet*, and D'Avenant in his much earlier time did nothing much out of the way when, as Downes said, he turned *Macbeth* into a kind of opera. What is more noteworthy than the fact that D'Avenant tried his hand at cobbling *Macbeth* is the other fact that the result of his handiwork should have held the stage so long as it did. Garrick made a considerable pother about restoring Shakespeare's *Macbeth* to the theatre; but the restoration was so queer a process that the great actor-manager, who played Macbeth, wrote in a longish speech for himself, after he had received his death-wound from Macduff—in order, perhaps, as Foote was wont to mimic one of Garrick's special mannerisms (in Lothario),' to che-che-che-cheer his heart in dy-dy-dying.'

Even Macready did not get rid of the 'operatic' excrescences. I have before me three playbills of performances wherein he played Macbeth, on the 16th of January 1832 at Drury Lane, when the favourite singer, Mr. H. Phillips, appeared as Hecate, and among the 'Principal Singing Witches' were Miss Faucit, Mrs. Orger, Mrs. Humby, and Messrs. T. Cooke and Templeton; on the 20th of May 1833 at Covent Garden, when Phillips again was Hecate, and Mrs. Keeley was one of the 'Vocal Witches;' and on the 14th of June 1843 at Drury Lane, just before Macready 'relinquished the direction' of the theatre. On this occasion, of Macready's 'last appearance in a London theatre for a very considerable period,' the playbill, which announced Shakespeare's 'historical' tragedy of *Macbeth*, contained in the 'Chorus of Spirits and Witches' the names of Miss P. Horton, Mrs. Keeley, Mrs. A. Wigan (who also appeared as the gentlewoman attending on Lady Macbeth), and of Mr. J. Reeves, fresh from a brief career as a baritone, engaged as 'second tenor' and famous afterwards as the great tenor Sims Reeves. The part of Hecate was filled by the then far more celebrated singer Staudigl, of whom it is said, in a manuscript account of the performance by my mother, then a young girl, that he 'sung his best, and his best is very good.' Locke's music can certainly have had no better interpretation in Garrick's time than it found in Macready's. Macready, if my memory of a contemporary drawing by George Scharf serves me

rightly, appeared as Macbeth in something of a Highland costume with a bonnet. Garrick played the part in a scarlet, or, as on one occasion at least, a brown coat of his own time laced with gold; and it was the revolutionary Macklin who first dared to present Macbeth in an attempt at Highland garb. Doubtless many oddities might be unearthed as to the dressing of Macbeth by various actors. Two points concerning a part of his stage equipment, to wit his truncheon, have been preserved in different ways. Murdoch, a famous, and it would seem justly famous, American actor, has described how Edwin Forrest, who 'had but little imagination,' gave an effect undeniably original to a well-known passage in the speech beginning 'this supernatural soliciting cannot be ill, cannot be good.' The text, as Murdoch justly observes, shows plainly that Macbeth is carried away into the realm of fantasy, 'and yet,' Murdoch tells us,

> Mr. Forrest illustrated the words, 'And make my seated heart knock at my ribs, Against the use of nature,' by striking his armed breast with his truncheon, thereby transforming what was a silent inner force into a very noisy outward one.

Here, truly, was a plentiful lack of imagination on the player's part. Another incident concerning the truncheon I do not remember to have seen in print, but have often heard it told of Macready in the last act of *Macbeth*. The tragedian counted on an effect to be produced by dropping the truncheon from a momentarily unnerved hand just before the utterance of the words 'To-morrow and to-morrow and to-morrow.' When this point in the performance was reached a too zealous super who had not seen this rehearsed by the star, and who naturally wished to be in the great man's good graces, stepped deftly forward, picked up the truncheon, and, with a humility befitting alike his real and his assumed character, proffered it to Macbeth, who, taking it with disgusted rage, spoke the line thus: 'To-morrow—*er—beast*—and to-morrow—*err—brute*—and to-morrow—*errr—get off the stage!*' Another and more familiar legend of Macready's Macbeth is that when he spoke the words 'There's blood upon thy face' to the Murderer in the banquet scene, his tone and gesture were so awe-inspiring, yet so natural, that the subordinate, instead of answering ''Tis Banquo's then,' clapped his hand to his face and cried aloud, 'Is there, by G—?' So spontaneous a tribute to Macready's power over the magic of the scene must have ensured, one supposes, a measure of forgiveness for the breach of stage decorum.

A like forgiveness is said to have been sought and obtained deliberately by a light-hearted actor who played Lennox to Charles Kean's Macbeth, and missed his cue in the Pit of Acheron scene because he was absorbed in telling a waggish story in the green-room. When, hurried and flurried, he got on to the stage after repeated calls, instead of answering in the negative to the now infuriated Macbeth's 'Saw you the weird sisters?' he blurted out, 'Yes, my lord.' Then

to Charles Kean's involuntary 'The devil you did! Where are they then?' he made reply, 'If your Majesty will deign to step round the corner I'll show you!' Naturally not much more of that scene was heard. The actor of Lennox, however, as the legend continues, made his peace by declaring that he had been watching the scene from the wing and had been 'so dazzled by the effulgence' of Charles Kean's 'brilliant orbs' that he clean forgot where he was and what he was set down to say and do. There must be plenty of recorded instances of eccentricity, to put it mildly, in the interpretation of Macbeth by various actors. I saw and heard, many years ago, a player who was extremely popular in Shakespearean parts at a series of towns, which were in some sort a survival of one of the old 'circuits;' and one of his favourite characters was Macbeth. Yet so little comprehension had he of the task he too lightly undertook, that in the passage (i. 7): 'But in these cases, We still have judgment here,' he laid the whole emphasis on the word *judgment*, thus at one stroke nullifying the meaning of the words and of their context. Moreover, at the end of the scene in the court of Macbeth's castle, after the words 'Let's briefly put on manly readiness, And meet i' the hall together,' he remained alone on the stage, sank overcome on a bench, and dropped a dagger with a great clang from his hand as the curtain fell. Thereby he gained loud and continued applause, not only from the groundlings, but also from folk of education, who descanted largely to each other on the advantages of seeing so great a poet so nobly interpreted.

Of such experiences, and of anecdotes, well or ill-founded, touching stage presentations of *Macbeth* there is probably no end; but it is high time to come to Hecuba—that is to say, to the very interesting and much more than interesting production of *Macbeth* by Mr. Arthur Bourchier, at the Garrick Theatre, whence has sprung the grouping together of these memory-flotsams of stage history and tradition. It was easy to foresee from *The Merchant of Venice*, Mr. Bourchier's first managerial essay in Shakespearean production, that he would not enter lightly on so weighty a matter as the staging of *Macbeth*[1]; that the presentation would be informed with care, taste, scholarship; that there would be neither slavish adherence to tradition nor wantonly violent breaking away from it; in short, that all things would be done seemingly and in order by a director possessed of the mind to appreciate Shakespeare and of the will and power to convey that appreciation in greater or less degree to his audiences. All those who both saw and noted *The Merchant of Venice* at the Garrick know very well that the fulfilment of these conditions, not too frequently fulfilled, was far from being the limit to the excellences which characterised that performance. But *The Merchant of Venice*, called a comedy and played before Macklin's time as a comedy with no drop of tragic infusion, is

[1] In both productions he has had the valuable assistance of that clever Shakespearean scholar, Mr. Alan Mackinnon.

a very different play to deal with from *Macbeth*, which is called a tragedy and is a tragedy, and is like to be so considered. Players and students of to-day are removed from any feeling stronger than amazement at D'Avenant's furbelows, and are not disposed to entertain the opinion of D'Avenant's disciple in after-time, Charles Reade, who wrote to John Hollingshead that *Macbeth* was and should be treated as 'an operatic melodrama,' and was himself prepared to 'undertake the short improvements in the text' and to arrange for the provision of 'additional music required,' over and above Locke's, for the scenes of the three witches without the crowd of 'singing witches.' *Macbeth* is in truth, to borrow Pepys's phrase, so deep a tragedy, having no relief from a swelling surge of tragic emotion save what is to be found in the Porter and the Witches, that the swiftness and closeness of the action, whether they are or are not due, as some commentators hold them to be due, to the play as we know it being an abbreviated acting version, seem potent or even necessary parts of its undying attraction. The play, moreover, to emphasise the difference between it and anything which Mr. Bourchier had previously put on his stage, must stand or fall for success in representation by the playing of two exceptionally trying and tragic characters, Lady Macbeth and Macbeth himself. Lady Macbeth makes demands on an actress's perception, sensibility, expression far more profound and exacting than does the Portia of Belmont, to whom Miss Violet Vanbrugh imparted so much of brilliancy and of delicate pathos, and the one performance gave no sure warrant that the other would attain, as I think it does, to the heights and depths demanded by the poet and the dramatist.

There are of course more ways than one of interpreting the character of Lady Macbeth, and one of these, which may be termed traditional, has never appeared to me to be the right way. Murdoch, the American comedian, who played for a season at the Haymarket under Buckstone's management, and has been quoted as the authority for an account of Forrest's method in Macbeth, was not only, according to all accounts, an excellent actor and a good story-teller, but was also a fine critic of literature and dramatic art. An observation of his at the conclusion of a searching criticism of Miss Cushman's Lady Macbeth seems much to the point:

> I cannot forbear to remark [he wrote] upon the fact ('more in sorrow than in anger') that the manner of the stage Lady Macbeth is frequently so fiercely violent that it is enough to induce the spectator to feel that Shakespeare's heroine is not only fully capable of killing her own infant at sight, but, if occasion offered, could perpetrate by her own unaided efforts another general 'slaughter of the innocents' merely for the gratification of an insatiate thirst for blood.

This of course refers specially to the speech 'I have given suck,' etc., but it was evidently in this spirit of inhuman ferocity that the whole part was rendered by Miss Cushman, or, to be more precise, this hand-

and-glove intimacy with blood-guiltiness, with wickedness, and killing as a dreadful joy in itself, underlay her whole conception and execution of the character. That this view, perverted it may well be by course of time, could yet be traced to its origin in the performance of Mrs. Siddons seems probable. In *Notes upon Some of Shakespeare's Plays*, by Frances Anne Kemble, it appears that the accomplished author did not indeed regard Lady Macbeth as a monster who would in any circumstances have delighted in slaughter, but did consider her as one entirely devoid of conscience and of soul, that is, in common parlance, inhuman. She was, according to this view, gifted or cursed with 'an absence of imagination, together with a certain obtuseness of the nervous system,' which combined in her to produce great physical courage. There are other passages in the same interesting paper which are in curious contradiction of those quoted and inferred; but on the whole it would seem that Miss Kemble believed firmly in the virago version of Lady Macbeth. Such an idea is readily supported by certain passages in the part taken separately or lumped together in such fashion that their aggregate takes upon itself entirely false and unwarranted proportions. But how many entirely different personages might one not conjure out of the one individuality of *Hamlet* by applying a similar process to his utterances?

The very speech mentioned above, and delivered by too many actresses, who pay attention to the words only, as an outburst of unbridled and native ferocity, surely shows that Lady Macbeth was not, as Miss Kemble would have had us believe, destitute of imagination; and conscience, no matter how it may be stifled for a time, is ever of near kin to imagination. This speech has always appeared to me, and on this as on other points I find myself in entire agreement with Murdoch, as the exaggerated wild expression of a mind strung up by the prompting of ambition that knows no bounds of right or reason to a mastering readiness for crime, and by no means as a clue to the natural disposition of Lady Macbeth. That Lady Macbeth had in fact strong and womanly affections may be judged from her first speech, describing Macbeth's character. No woman could know her husband so thoroughly in all his weak points, and yet cling to him and call him in soliloquy, without a hint of irony, 'great Glamis,' unless the bonds that held her to him were those of a love which it would be absurd to regard as suddenly born of ambition. It is possible that the use of the word *chastise* in this soliloquy may have fostered a false idea of Lady Macbeth as a merely domineering woman with little or no grace and charm of womanhood; but it is applied to Macbeth's finer qualities which in the passion of a newly-fostered ambition she longs to pervert. Again, in the following soliloquy after the departure of the messenger who has brought the 'great news' of Duncan's coming, there are expressions which by their mere force may have induced a misreading of the meaning and, by consequence, of the whole character.

> The raven himself is hoarse
> That croaks the fatal entrance of Duncan
> Under my battlements. Come, you spirits
> That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
> And fill me from the crown to the toe top-full
> Of direst cruelty! make thick my blood;
> Stop up the access and passage to remorse,
> That no compunctious visitings of nature
> Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
> The effect and it!

Terrible words, truly, and of a most cruel sound. But if, as many worthy folk have considered, Lady Macbeth is by nature unwomanly and cruel, why, not being a fool, should she invoke spirits, in commune with herself, to unsex her and fill her with cruelty? If she were of an overpoweringly masculine turn, why should she in the later lines appeal to 'murdering ministers' to take her milk for gall? And if she were devoid of imagination, as well as of all that is pleasant in woman, whence and why the utterance concerning the raven? As to imagination other passages might be cited, among them the words (in ii. 2) about the sleeping and the dead, while in the opening soliloquy of the same scene, in the infinitely tragic 'had he not resembled My father as he slept, I had done 't,' there is strong indication that Lady Macbeth was anything but unwomanly by nature; and that all she got by her exalted appeal to the 'spirits that tend on mortal thoughts' that they should unsex her, was a temporary blindness to every consideration outside or against the overwhelming ambition that clamoured in her for immediate satisfaction—an ambition which may have been partly suggested by Macbeth being of the blood royal, one of the facts which give pause to the less blinded Macbeth himself.

Then, in the appalling dialogue after the murder of Duncan, who that looks carefully into Lady Macbeth's speeches will find in them proof of a domineering swashing disposition, or indeed of anything but a desire—marching hand-in-hand it is true with a settled purpose of reaping the fruits of crime without delay or danger—to apply such consolation as can be given in word and manner to her husband's mental anguish? Observe, too, in this connection that she says: 'These deeds must not be thought After these ways; so, it will make us mad.' Not 'it will make *you* mad'; she associates herself with him in that fear as though the conscience, not completely muted, sent forth a whisper of warning, unheeded at the moment but terribly fulfilled afterwards in the sleep-walking scene. For as to that scene Miss Kemble's suggestion that the sleep-walker's sufferings are entirely due to a reaction of physical repulsion, that the mind has nothing whatever to do with them, and that as for soul, of that Lady Macbeth was, at any rate after the planning and carrying out of the murder, absolutely destitute—this suggestion may surely be regarded as untenable from every point of view. To leave aside other cases in point, there is one, in itself a mere

trifle it may be thought, which has always seemed to me confirmation strong of the supposition that Lady Macbeth was far from being unsexed. That is the form in which, in iii. 2, Macbeth addresses her :

> Ere the bat hath flown
> there shall be done
> A deed of dreadful note.
> LADY M. What's to be done ?
> M. Be innocent of the knowledge, dearest chuck,
> Till thou applaud the deed.

What man with any scrap of wisdom—and Macbeth was no more a fool than Lady Macbeth, save in so far as all criminals are fools—would address a hectoring virago, even with a touch of irony, as 'dearest chuck,' having, moreover, addressed her without any possibility of irony as 'love' but a minute before ? And to back internal evidence, history and fiction combine in the proposition that it is not, as a rule, your 'masculine' woman, but on the contrary your extra-womanly woman, who, having set mind and soul, energy, and capacity, to the attainment of one only object for good or ill, shows in the one case the most unflinching, in the other the most ruthless, determination and courage.

It is no tearing, bloody-minded termagant figuring in the robes of chieftainess and queen that Miss Vanbrugh presents to us as Lady Macbeth. On her first entrance, reading the letter just received from the Thane, it is evident from tone, gesture, and haviour that Lady Macbeth is a woman not only of high breeding, as, of course, she must be, but also of a high degree of sensibility, and not in the least of an inhuman nature. Yet the fine shades in the reading of the letter seem to indicate the sudden pushing of an ambition which in itself is no absolutely new thing. The following speech, already specially mentioned, wherein Lady Macbeth reviews the obstacles which Macbeth's character may put in the way of reaching the great goal, is made by the actress's subtle art to convey plainly, but by no means obtrusively, a commingling of a very human affection for Macbeth with an absolutely pitiless resolve to bend in this matter his will to hers : and thus the speech may be said to give, as Miss Vanbrugh delivers it, the key to the actress's complete idea of Lady Macbeth's strange individuality, compelling others, not by brute violence, but by all fascinations at the command of a brilliantly gifted woman, employed to subordinate all people and all things to the realisation of what, from being perhaps a notion nebulously floating, has with one leap become a fixed idea. In all her dealings with Macbeth the affectionate and caressing side of her nature is to be discerned. When he goes back upon his first inclining to reach the throne by any means, and when she resorts to taunt instead of to cajoling persuasion as a spur to the sides of his intent, the taunt is not a violent and bitter vituperation. Were it so, indeed, Macbeth would hardly answer it

as he does. The whole speech beginning 'Was the hope drunk' is a lash, but a lash applied in order to rouse, not to scarify. The succeeding speech, containing the celebrated passage 'I have given suck' &c., is generally delivered by the representative of Lady Macbeth standing erect in the middle of the stage, and hurling it like a bomb-shell into the face more of the audience than of Macbeth himself. Miss Vanbrugh delivers much of it with intense meaning, but without a shade of rant, half-kneeling by Macbeth's chair, and thus emphasises again the humanity potent for good or ill that is part and parcel of Lady Macbeth's inmost nature.

But from this it is not to be inferred that Miss Vanbrugh either neglects or in any way fails in expressing the more terrible side—that which is occupied by the unwavering purpose, not to kill for killing's sake, but to reach a certain end, however criminal may be the killing necessary as a means to that end. This aspect of the character, discernible, as has been hinted, in the opening speech, is kept in sight throughout, as is the superficially contradictory fact that the *ewigweibliche* is never extinct in Lady Macbeth. But neither side is emphasised at the complete expense of the other. Thus there is terror enough in the grim resolution of the murder scene, but there is also the human touch in the indication of a woman's nerves strained by that very resolution to such a point that her swooning—and here one may ask if a Lady Macbeth of blood and iron would have swooned at such a juncture—seems the only possible conclusion to the effort. So in the banquet scene anxiety does not override a natural and trained courtesy; and so especially in the sleep-walking scene, where, besides and above terror, pity is rightly aroused in the audience as it is in the witnesses on the stage. The presentation of Lady Macbeth and Macbeth, at the very end of the banquet scene, both overcome by horror at some fancied or unseen presence, effective as it is, may be open to question; but to go into that question fully would be a lengthy business. In another passage I dislike Miss Vanbrugh's reading of the words 'We fail' as a statement instead of as an exclamation at once of scorn and of encouragement. Miss Vanbrugh has Mrs. Siddons's authority; but then she does not in other respects follow Mrs. Siddons implicitly. Apart from this, and, naturally, from details here and there of intonation or gesture, I have nothing but admiration for a very fine and impressive piece of tragic acting.

In facing the part of Macbeth, Mr. Bourchier undertook an even heavier task than did Miss Vanbrugh in playing Lady Macbeth. For one thing, from various instances, past and present, that might be cited, it would seem as if a man in leaving one line of dramatic art to take up a part in an entirely different line is more handicapped than a woman who does the same thing. This may have to do, perhaps, with flexibility of voice and with natural adaptability to

changed circumstances. However that may be, I think that old playgoers who search their memory will find illustrations to back this supposition occurring to them readily enough. This is comparatively a minor matter, but it accounts for Mr. Bourchier's at times assuming tones which seem more germane to colloquial comedy than to the stress and storm of *Macbeth*. This is to be noted chiefly in 'level' dialogue; but Mr. Bourchier must know well that level speeches are always fullest of pitfalls. In certain passages of *Macbeth* such tones have been deliberately assumed by great actors, notably by Macready, and have generally invited some adverse criticism. But that consideration is of little weight when compared with the immense difficulty of Macbeth's character as a whole. Of this difficulty Macbeth's own words addressed to Macduff in the scene after the murder give unconsciously a vivid if incomplete sketch. Who, he exclaims, when asked why he killed the grooms—

> Who can be wise, amazed, temperate and furious,
> Loyal and neutral, in a moment?

Now this and much more that is baffling and contradictory it may be said that Macbeth in fact is, as we see him from the beginning to the end of the play. The description of his character given by Lady Macbeth after her reading of the letter is accurate so far as it goes. But it gives no real hint that Macbeth joins in himself the genius and martial ardour of a great captain to the quick and easily wrought imagination of a sensitive poet. Of this it is true we have had an inkling, as also of his obviousness to supernatural or superstitious influences in his previous scene with the Witches. But from this who could conclude that when he had screwed his courage to the sticking place and accomplished the murder of Duncan he would in the first immediate throes of remorse deliver himself of an extraordinarily beautiful encomium on sleep?—or that, once launched on crime, he would outdo in prodigality of wickedness his first prompting accomplice?—that he would be so shattered by the appearance of Banquo's ghost, and immediately afterwards so resolute, so filled with a horrible seeming of logic, in setting himself to pile yet more wickedness on what has gone before 'for mine own good'? In reading the play with close attention we can discern the same Macbeth through all his variations and phases of mood and character, until at the last we find the warrior element, proper to his first entrance, asserting itself in a struggle to the death. But for a player in the swift and stormy passage of Macbeth on the stage to show us all these and yet more differences, and to make of them a complete and harmonious whole—that indeed is a feat of amazing difficulty. In truth, though one change in *Macbeth* is marked plainly enough, that from the novice in crime to the master who outdoes and dominates his erstwhile teacher; yet so varied, so strangely interwoven are the subtle trans-

mutations in his inmost self, that one may doubt if any actor, however complete his own intellectual and poetic grasp of these may be, can convey the whole mystery of Macbeth to an audience. The student depends largely for any understanding of them on reading and marking things said of and to Macbeth by people of all conditions. Wherefore it might be said without exaggeration that, to make these shades and variations quite clear and logical to a bevy of spectators, the actor of Macbeth would need to be supported in every character by a player like to himself in penetration and power of expression. What Mr. Bourchier does, as it seems to me, with a prodigious task is, to put it briefly, to show us some of Macbeth's many aspects with absolute success, to indicate others with the perception and practical skill of a fine artist who has the technicalities of his art at his very fingers' ends, and at times to present a mistaken rendering, though far be it from me to say whether the mistake comes from misapprehension or from the actor's powers being overtaxed by the hurricane force and sweep of the complex character. What is very noteworthy is that his greatest triumph is achieved in what is often regarded as the crux of the part, and certainly is one of its most trying and difficult scenes. This is the address in soliloquy to the air-drawn dagger. We had seen already in Macbeth's first scene how well Mr. Bourchier welded together the warrior nature and the poetical imagination; and the scenes following had been full of fine and delicate if sometimes restless touches in action, intonation, and by-play. Here, from the beginning of the scene to the end of the speech, we saw and heard the true Macbeth, warrior, poet, slave to spells, and seer of visions. The poetical and dramatic value of the lines was fully appreciated and fully conveyed, and every movement of the visionary as he followed spellbound the course of the elusive dagger helped to convey the sense of mysterious terror attaching to one, as Schlegel says, 'fairly entangled in the snares of hell.' Very fine were the varying tones in 'Mine eyes are made the fools o' the other senses, Or else worth all the rest,' and very spontaneous and thrilling was the change at 'I go, and it is done.' Of equal excellence, though in their nature less striking, were the lighter portions of the banquet scene, and of very high merit in a combination of dignity and villainy the directions to the murderers. The scene at and after the appearance of the ghost of Banquo was again a triumphant grappling with a most trying situation. Again the lines were excellently spoken, and the rush of various emotions between terror, rage, anxiety, up to the final return to being 'a man again' was represented with the true fire, and yet with well-judged discrimination.

It was in the last act that I chiefly found something lacking though here, too, there are many points of much merit to be noted, such, for instance, as the speech on the news that 'the queen is dead,'

and the intense and concentrated, not loud-voiced, rage and horror in 'Liar and slave!' The more martial speeches seemed to want the true ring—to come, indeed, in their tumbling frenzy perilously near to hysterical excitement; and it may be that Mr. Bourchier makes the mistake of over-hurrying action and speech, which in themselves are already fully enough hurried. There is much agility and there is much vigour in the final combat between Macbeth and Macduff; but it cannot be approved on the score of swordsmanship, nor commended for its dragging out a situation which should be brought to an end with a swiftness fitting to the whole action of the play.

To have done what Mr. Bourchier has done with the part of Macbeth is to have displayed capabilities as an actor of poetical and tragic drama which may have taken some by surprise, and which may lead one to hope that 'the greatest is behind.' As a manager he is to be congratulated on the complete sufficiency, avoiding excess either in elaboration or in simplicity of the mounting and stage business, and on the general high level of the acting. Praise is specially due to Mr. Cyril Keightley's well-graced and manly Macduff. I cannot approve the consant cackling laughter of the witches, irritating in itself and scarce fitting to those who are, again as Schlegel has it, instruments or emblems of 'hostile powers.' That they should laugh fiendishly on occasion is well enough; but the excess inclines one to quote Dr. Johnson with a difference—'This merriment of *witches* is mighty offensive.' Against one other thing must a protest be made—the pronunciation by everyone of *Glamis* as a monosyllable. It ruins the rhythm, and as the old spelling is *Glammis* there seems no warrant for it save modern custom, which has nothing to say to the matter.

WALTER HERRIES POLLOCK.

THE NEW SITUATION IN GERMANY

I

One of the results of the elections for the Reichstag, as regards the question of the defensive power of the country, which has led to the last dissolution, is, shortly speaking, this. Government will be able to count, in matters of reasonable Army and Navy strength, and its colonial policy connected therewith, on a probable majority of forty or so, as against any possible renewed combination between the priestly, Ultramontane party called the 'Centre,' and the now greatly diminished party of Social Democrats who on principle refuse granting all such supplies. This is one point of the new situation.

The other point is that, during the manifestations of the electioneering campaign, a public spirit, at once patriotic and Liberal, in the sense of claiming greater parliamentary privilege, has shown itself, with which the Imperial Crown will have to reckon henceforth. It is the spirit that marked the years shortly before 1848. Because unsatisfied then by timely concession, it led finally to sanguinary street battles, when crowned heads were deeply humiliated—so much so that Frederick William the Fourth of Prussia afterwards said: 'In those days we all lay flat on our bellies.'

When the last Reichstag was dissolved on account of what has been called the 'Unholy Alliance' between the Papist party and the Socialists, who would leave the struggling troops in South Africa in the lurch, the Kaiser and the Chancellor evidently hoped that it would be possible to lay a strong breach into the 'Tower of the Centre,' as that party boastfully calls itself. A noteworthy diminution of the forces of Social Democracy, Government scarcely expected or hoped for.

Matters, however, have practically turned out just the other way. Personally, I may be allowed to mention, I have not been astonished by this issue. To a considerable extent I predicted it in what I had written before. Whilst uttering the parole: 'Down with the priestling Centre! and up with the Rights of the People!' I was quite aware of the difficulties standing in the way of overcoming the Centre. At the same time I said that there was the greatest likelihood of the Social Democratic party losing very many seats, if the so-called 'Mitläufer' were for once to turn away from it, and if the mass of the laggards, who

hitherto have never used their vote, could be made to enter into the fray.

This forecast has proved to be correct. 'Mitläufer'—men who merely run for a time with a party without sharing all its doctrines—those are called who at the previous election had gradually swelled the number of the Socialist vote to so vast an extent. At one time the chief Socialist leader himself avowed that the majority of those voters for his party were merely 'Mitläufer'; their object mainly was, to make things hot for Government from various motives of political and social dissatisfaction, as well as from a Democratic wish of giving a needed lesson to 'personal Government.' Among these men, it is well known, there are even a considerable number of minor Government officials who have a grudge against their superiors, or who detest the present system.

The Socialists in Parliament, barring a few personal exceptions, have always refused to Government the means for military and naval armament. They do it, as already mentioned, continually on principle. Their aspirations are certainly of a Democratic character, and therefore they are naturally opposed to that personal government which prevailed under Bismarck, and which has been continued under the present Kaiser, who, as soon as he came to the throne, wanted to be 'his own Bismarck.' Now, were there any possibility of replacing Imperial rule by a Republican one, the tactics of the party in Parliament could be understood, if adopted on the eve of a likely final decision. But such a prospect does not exist. For twenty-five years their prominent speakers have often prophesied 'a great Kladderadatsch,' as a Socialist revolution was called in common parlance. But nothing even distantly approaching to it has ever happened.

There was once a considerable chance of the Prussian House of Commons—before the constitution of the present Empire—coming into revolutionary conflict with the Crown. It was in the early days of Bismarck's and his King's 'budgetless' government. The Liberal and Radical middle class, and many men of the working classes, were deeply moved against despotic kingship. But what happened? Lassalle, the professed Socialist leader, entered into underhand intrigues with Bismarck, promising to rouse the masses against the burgher party, so as to get the latter between two fires. The royal army in front, a demagogically misled populace in the rear, of the champions of parliamentary privilege were to play the monarchical game!

I can give here some proofs from personal knowledge. In order to fortify himself with the working class in Germany, Lassalle wrote to Louis Blanc, then an exile in London, in a general Socialistic way, for the object of getting from him a kind of testimonial for sincere doctrinal comradeship. Knowing well how matters stood, I warned my French friend who had shown me the letter. Meanwhile Lassalle, in a speech, came out with a declaration that the House of Hohenzollern, 'as the

representative of true popular kingship (*Volks-Königthum*), must, with a firm grip of the hand on the sword, drive the middle class from the stage, with a proclamation of manhood suffrage!'

It is too well known how that Constitutional struggle ended with the triumph of Bismarck and his master who, in 1849, after being victorious in the battles against the popular armies that fought in Rhenish Bavaria and Baden for German freedom and union, had court-martialled a number of his prisoners during a three months' reign of terror. As to Prussian affairs in the 'sixties, universal suffrage was not proclaimed in the least. The Prussian House of Commons remains until to-day constituted in the same way as before.

Louis Blanc afterwards thanked me heartily for having prevented him from falling into a trap. Later on, Lassalle was shot in a duel. The conflict arose with a Rumanian rival for the hand of a young German lady of aristocratic connection, whom Lassalle wanted to marry in order to give himself a higher social standing, but who had already been very much cooled by his semi-diplomatic behaviour. In this affair General Klapka, the heroic defender of Komorn during the Hungarian war of independence, played a part as a friend of Lassalle. Klapka, who was also a friend of mine, later on told me that the Countess Hatzfeld (the well-known protectress of Lassalle) had said to him: 'If Lassalle had lived six months longer, he would have entered the service of the Prussian Government!'

Yet Lassalle's portrait still figures at Social Democratic party meetings!

I refer to these facts to show how a popular party, in an epoch of great crisis, can be misled by a self-seeking character. Social Democrats in Germany might learn something from this authenticated occurrence.

II

Perhaps I may be allowed to add here that the very name of Social Democrat, with the addition of Republican, dates by no means from recent times, as is often erroneously assumed, but from 1848. It was used then in France, and in Germany as well. When we were near having our bodies stretched on the sand-heap by court-martial bullets, or our heads severed by the executioner's sword, we did not shrink from using the word. The largest possible social reforms were our confessed aim. Not only the fullest unity and freedom, but also the security of our Fatherland, were dear to us. Many held the same doctrines as are preached now; but the large majority even of these felt that it is useless to try forcing a people into what it regards as an impossible Utopia.

Whatever far-reaching system of social transformation men may aspire to, no one with any experience of human nature can doubt that the masses themselves, in spite of all the sufferings of which

they have a right to complain, are not prepared to accept a downright Communistic organisation of society. In their wretched condition they may eagerly listen to a glowing description of a Golden Age; but they will not, when things come to the point, give up a certain degree of individual freedom. The sensible social reformer has to heed that which has become ingrained in human character during thousands of years. He must show that he is willing and able to work for the practical relief of misery, or else he will suddenly be left alone with his most splendid philosophical programmes of political economy. He must be ready also to take proper care of that first requisite in a nation's life: its security against manifest danger from abroad.

Germany, especially, has good reason not to neglect that latter consideration. She is geographically placed so that she may be attacked from four quarters, on land and on sea. The Thirty Years' War, the Seven Years' War, and the Napoleonic wars have been a severe lesson to her. They sometimes brought her to the verge of annihilation. Surely it speaks much for the prevalence of a spirit of dissatisfaction with home government that, nevertheless, millions of votes, even if only cast in great part by 'Mitläufer,' are still cast now in Germany for the Social Democratic party. That should be a lesson to Government.

But there is a point at which a lesson also is given to Social Democracy itself. And this lesson has just now been read to it by the loss of so many seats in a number of important towns, which pre-eminently count in politics when large issues are decided.

It is no use saying that, after all, the aggregate Socialist vote has not been diminished, but slightly even increased. Here it must not be forgotten that, proportionally speaking, that increase, as compared with that of the other parties, is exceedingly small; for it has to be remembered that, owing to the rapid growth of the population, as well as to the participation of millions who until now had not voted at all, there has been a vastly larger number of men who exercised the suffrage in 1907 than there were in 1903.

Socialist writers and speakers themselves acknowledge now that they have lost many of their former 'Mitläufer,' in whom suddenly a patriotic sentiment was awakened when they saw the Pope's band joining the party with which they had allied themselves. The chief fact, however, is, that the Socialist loss has occurred in the most influential centres of political movement, and of industry and trade. That counts far more than mere numbers in constituencies of second, third, or fourth-rate importance. The fall from eighty-one seats (as they were originally in 1903), or seventy-nine, as they were afterwards, to forty-three—that is to say, to nearly one half—is a rout impossible to get over.

Nor are men wanting both in the advanced and in the more mode-

rate, or 'Revisionist,' wing of the Social Democratic party who fully acknowledge the tremendous lesson they have received. The defeated Socialist candidate in the first constituency of Berlin, a highly cultured man of University training and standing, has said since before a meeting of his adherents :—

Though our organisation is satisfactory, we have committed heavy faults in our agitation. Since we have become a party of 3,000,000 we have been struck with a mental arrogance which has hindered us from a proper manner of agitation. We paraded our strength in braggart manner, and did not understand how to act upon men of another way of thinking. Before Trades Union colleagues, who were not organised, we acted the swaggering part of the superior, invincible Social Democrat, spurning them instead of trying to gain them over. Such people we should not treat as if they were asses, but rather as somewhat backward younger brothers. Therefore, away with that haughty pride, and let us behave as our comrades did years ago!

In the Revisionist camp of the party, still more significant language is held—as, for instance, in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* of February. There the old complaints are repeated about the 'intolerable suppression of all free discussion at Party Congresses,' the 'proclamation of dogmas which nobody is allowed to touch, even as is done in the Catholic Church with its orthodoxy and infallibility.' This state of things 'leads to an ossification of intellect among the party, and so a sterility of our whole action.' Such procedures are compared to the Romanist 'tribunals against heretics,' and so forth.

More than that. There are Socialists now who acknowledge that, in the interest of the working classes, a good word might be said for a proper colonial policy; that, after all, the people must live; that it is not advisable to offend the national sentiment, or to act in a way which would only be to the profit of foreign capitalism. In saying this, they point to the betterment which has taken place in the lot of the working class. They declare that the 'famine parole,' which has been given out by the party leaders in this election, is a manifest exaggeration, and that working men who, from experience of their own, can prove that an amelioration has taken place, are becoming shy of other party dogmas which they cannot control, but which now they suspect; feeling, as they do, that they have been imposed upon on the particular subject with which they are best acquainted from their own daily life.

These avowals of self-knowledge have been produced by this signal electoral defeat; but their scope might yet be extended. So long as the chief leader's declaration is repeated: 'I am the mortal foe of the whole civic society!' neither advanced social reforms, nor the movement for greater parliamentary rights, will have much better chance. It is by such needlessly threatening and yet powerless utterances that reactionary and despotic tendencies manage to thrive.

III

One thing that cannot be omitted by way of explaining the great change brought about by these elections is this. When it was seen, in Germany, that in the foreign press the Ultramontanes were patted on the back as if they were genuine 'Liberal opponents of personal government,' whilst the Socialists, with their programme of the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution, and communication, were, remarkably enough, compared to 'simple English Moderates, or even parliamentary Conservatives,' many German readers asked themselves: 'What is the meaning of such strange statements? Is it sheer ignorance? Why, that is impossible! If not ignorance, what lurks behind this sudden care for our Clericalists and for a party which the very same foreign papers most bitterly fight against at home, as against Utopian Impossibilists and uprooters of the whole foundation of society?'

Then it was suspected that the object was, to encourage two parties—'*qui hurlent en se trouvant ensemble*,' as the French phrase is—to a common prolonged strife against the powers that be in Germany, so as to throw the country into an interminable strife and utter confusion, and thus to paralyse the nation in general. The German press, I may say, is very well informed, day by day, about foreign affairs and opinions. It is better informed than the English press is from abroad. The effect of the articles in question has, no doubt, been to rally the patriotic sentiment against the 'Unholy Alliance.'

The idea of describing the Ultramontane, obscurantist, Vaticanist, at heart not patriotic men of the Centre, who mainly go by the counsels and behests of the Pope, as specimens of an Opposition against 'Personal Government' is too rich not to evoke laughter. Why, they acknowledge the personal government of a foreign priest claiming theocratic dominion over all kings and all nations, over Monarchies and Republics, in matters both spiritual and temporal!

When the present High Pontiff was installed by his priestly confederates, it was done in the same audacious words as of old. He was declared to be the Master of all Kings and Princes and nations. There were those who, nevertheless, believed that Pius the Tenth would turn out differently. I foretold in an English magazine at once that this was a hollow hope. Even as of old, there are, besides the White Pope, who bears the Pontifical name, the Black Pope and the Red Pope of the Inquisition and of the Propaganda, and the whole Jesuitry connected with it. It is the Black Pope and the Red Pope who keep the White Pope up to the mark. If ever he did swerve from the line, the fate of Pope Ganganelli is before him.

The fear of being anathematised by this foreign priest and his dependents of a Church which remains *semper eadem*, makes it very

difficult to diminish the strength of the 'Tower' of the Catholic Centre. A Protestant or free-minded Government can only overcome its influence by a Progressist policy. It is to the discredit of successive imperial administrations in Germany that they have so long humoured this mediævalist party by concessions, in order to get support from it for the personal policy of the head of the Empire. Often enough, however, even as in the Middle Ages, a conflict arose between the two—so much so that Bismarck once spoke the winged word: 'To Canossa we shall never go!'

It was a well-known allusion to the fate of Henry the Fourth. In windy weather, in deep snow, he had to do penance, during several days, clad in a shirt, in the courtyard of the castle of Canossa, in Italy, whilst the haughty Bishop of Rome, and—to speak politely—his lady friend, looked down from the window upon this edifying spectacle of a king's humiliation. In honour of Bismarck's saying, a column was erected in the Harz Mountains, with the words in question as an inscription. But then Bismarck, rather than give up his own autocratic ways towards a refractory Parliament, did 'go to Canossa'! He at last yielded to the Centre, against whose obscurantist doings the 'Kulturkampf' had been initiated, as our friend, Virchow, the great scientist, had called it.

To cap the deplorable issue, the column in the Harz Mountains was one day struck by lightning and split. Thereupon the priestlings of the Centre, always ready with their stock of supernatural miracles, exclaimed that the 'finger of God' had done it. A class of the population which remains subject to such religious teaching will always be difficult to wean from religious and political superstition. That is the whole secret of the continued strength of the 'Centre' in the Reichstag. It has come back with an increase of two or three seats gained, whereas those of its late Social Democratic ally were so vastly diminished.

It is truly a pity that, in some cases, the Socialist party in various constituencies has, for the second ballots, advised its own adherents to vote, by preference, for a partisan of the Ultramontane Centre, rather than for a Liberal! On the contrary, in some other constituencies, the Radical, Progressist, or Democratic parties advised their friends to vote even rather for a Socialist than for a follower of the Vaticanist gang. To see Socialists as 'Mitläufer' of that band of monkish obscurantists who yearn for the recall of the Jesuits is, indeed, a sorry spectacle.

IV

As a means of avoiding true parliamentary government, the same policy of underhand negotiations with the Ultramontanes as had finally been yielded to by Bismarck, was carried on under subsequent Chancellors. Prince Bülow was sadly at fault in this.

Things would, nevertheless, not have come to that pass had not that section of Liberals, who are called 'National Liberals,' in the course of years approached more and more to the reactionary group in Parliament, and had not the more advanced Progressists and Democrats split up into three groups. Amidst such divisions, Court policy and Jesuitical craftiness easily ruled the roost.

However, of late, all over Germany a movement has made itself felt for rising against the unbearable personal interference of the Crown. When matters became worse and worse, men remembered that the National Parliament of 1848-49—but for the previous existence of which the present Reichstag would never have come into life—had claimed and actually exercised supreme power. It did so literally in the name of the 'Sovereignty of the People' until it was destroyed by force of arms. There are still not a few men alive who were active in those days of a great upheaval.

It is a noteworthy fact that during the last session of the Reichstag even a foremost leader of the National Liberals denounced 'personal government' in remarkably strong terms. He did not shrink from hints at the Emperor's person. This unexpected spectacle showed which way the wind blew. Prince Bülow and William the Second himself, no doubt, understood it as a sign of the times.

It was observed, during the electioneering campaign, that the bearing of the Kaiser towards the municipality of Berlin had latterly changed in a remarkable degree. Formerly, it was stated in the Progressist press, he often showed the City Fathers a frowning, ungracious face. All at once there was a pleasant show of politeness and condescending good humour. In years gone by, when an inscription was to be placed over the portal of the graveyard where the victims of the street battle of the 18th of March, 1848, who converted a despotic monarchy into a constitutional one, sleep their eternal sleep, William the Second forbade the inscription. Again, when burgomaster Kirschner was elected, the Kaiser, for a long time, refused giving his sanction. When the Town Council of the capital wished to dedicate to him a beautifully sculptured public fountain, made by one of the most distinguished artists, he once more gave the municipality an ungracious snub. Their representative, coming to the palace with a loyal address, was not received, but had to lay that document on a chair!

Then came the change, and it was much appreciated. How easy it is to satisfy a people! And yet monarchs will often drive matters to the breaking point. But the fault, after all, is with the people themselves. They are too easily satisfied, and then monarchs boldly presume upon that trait; great personal power spoiling the character even of the best.

When the dictatorial attitude of the leaders of the Centre had become intolerable for the secular Power, the Emperor, through

his Chancellor, came to a sudden resolution. In course of time that Clericalist party had constituted itself as what was called a regular secondary, or collateral, government (*Neben-Regierung*). One of theirs, the very man who is now expected to be its leader in the new Reichstag, had for some time dallied with the Social Democratic movement, attending, it is stated, one of its Congresses at Zürich. It was done in the true Jesuitical style of gaining a footing in opposite quarters. In this way the occupants of the Ultramontane 'Tower' thought they had secured their permanent influence. The sneering manner in which they laughed to scorn every effort at dislodging them from their Fort could, however, not be brooked much longer.

Hence the new Colonial Secretary, Herr Dernburg, a man not trained in the dark and surreptitious ways of such dishonourable policy as the disciples of Loyola are accustomed to, came out in Parliament with strong language against that false party of partisans of a foreign High Priest. No sooner was this done than the Centre made common cause with the out-and-out antagonists of the whole political and social State organisation as it exists at present. It did not matter then to these Popelings that they had to join hands with men whose undoubtedly Republican and freethinking aspirations are otherwise looked upon with horror at the Vatican. All through the centuries the Papacy has never scrupled to make use of the most variegated means for sustaining its own hateful theocratic power. Any nation that respects itself is bound to cast it out. That is why all friends of intellectual freedom and of national dignity look with sympathetic approval at what is being done now in France.

V

It must have cost an effort to the Kaiser to appoint as Colonial Director a man of Jewish origin, for cleaning the Augean stable of colonial maladministration in South Africa. Too long, in Prussia at least, Jews have been kept out of superior positions both in the Army and in the Administration. In other German States there is far less of that antiquated, mediævalist policy which is a perfect disgrace of our age. When I look back upon the days of the German Revolution, during which a citizen of Jewish descent acted as Speaker of the National Assembly at Frankfurt, and when other notable men of that race, like Johann Jacoby, played a prominent part, it is all the more painful to see what retrogression has taken place in that respect, especially in Prussia, owing to the bigoted course pursued in the highest quarters.

Let us hope that a change for the better has now begun, and that the hopes put in this 'new man' will be properly fulfilled. His style of speaking before large audiences has proved an incisive and energetic one, correct in matters of fact, as behoves one who

has had a commercial and financial training. True, he has been reproved even by a Liberal paper, which is otherwise quite on his side, and free from religious or racial prejudice, because it thought it detected a note of undue self-laudation in his repeated saying: 'For twenty-five years we have had colonies, but no colonial policy.' But Herr Dernburg will, no doubt, soon get rid of such oratorical slips; for, as the Berlin journal rightly says, 'speeches are, after all, only assignments for the future,' and 'the proof of a very necessary reform in colonial affairs, which he is to work out, has yet to be furnished. We must wait to see what he is able to do.' All other information is, however, to the effect that Herr Dernburg will be as good as his word.

VI

Some details as to the constitutional powers of the Reichstag will here be in their place. I have seen it stated of late, in various English journals, that that Parliament has no right of initiative, that it can only say 'yes' or 'no' to Government Bills.

This is an absolute error. A great many motions, in the way of Bills, are continually made in the Reichstag by private members. If they are passed, the Upper House may, or may not, reject them, even as is done in this country by the so-called hereditary wisdom of born legislators. The only difference is, that here they sit in virtue of their own right, whilst in Germany the Upper House, or Federal Council, is composed of the delegates of the various princely governments and of the three Free Republican cities. These latter are the only ones still left from the more than a hundred such free cities once existing in the older Empire, which was an aristocratic commonwealth, with a large number of free towns, and a King, or Kaiser, who had no hereditary right of succession, but was elected for life—on condition of observing the country's constitution.

Perhaps even casual readers in England may remember a case of the initiative of the Reichstag. Ever since that Parliament has existed, it has always unanimously voted for the motion of some deputy who proposed 'payment of members.' The Upper House, at the beck and call of princely Governments, regularly rejected the measure. Prince Bismarck was afraid that, through payment of members, too many Liberal and Radical opponents of his might come in. Germany is, territorially, a large country, even since she has lost Austria; and there are not many men with independent fortunes who could travel to, and remain at, Berlin for a great part of the year. Hence so often a *quorum* is not to be got in the Reichstag; especially as it is fixed at 199 members, in a House of but 397.

Quite recently, however, the often-demanded reform, for which the Reichstag had taken the initiative, was at last agreed to by the Imperial Government and by the delegates of the Confederated

Princes and Free Cities. A dissolution of the Reichstag, I may add, cannot be decreed by the Kaiser alone. The Federal Council has to give its approbation.

As to the questions of military and naval armament, the Kaiser can neither get a single man nor a ship more than there are at present without the consent of the Reichstag. Repeatedly, proposals of the Imperial Government have been rejected. On other occasions parliamentary assent was only got after laborious negotiations, or after a dissolution, when the country at large sided with Government.

It will thus be seen that the field is free, in some ways, for the new Reichstag, if only the Liberal and Radical groups, which have come back with increased numbers, are true to their professed principles, and worth their salt. In numbers, the National Liberals—somewhat altered in tone for the better through late experience—the Free People's party, the Free Progressist Union, the German People's party, and the German Reform party all show an increased strength.

The Centre remains as it was, with the addition of two, or, according to other accounts, three seats, but with greatly diminished influence. In fact, it is stated that nine of its seats were only obtained by way of a bargain which delivered over twelve other seats to the Social Democrats. But as these latter now dispose only of forty-three seats, which, without the help of the Centre, would to all evidence even have been reduced to thirty-one, it is clear that the Ultramontanes are now deprived of an ally without whom they are henceforth powerless.

Here, that special institution, the second ballot, or 'Stichwahl,' has to be touched upon. In Germany it is not enough that a candidate should have a greater number of votes than any other competitor. He must have a majority over the votes of all other candidates combined. If he has not, a second ballot is to be taken between the two candidates who are next in number to each other. Then, if several competitors have been in the field, a bargaining usually begins, in which often the most discordant elements have to make an arrangement between themselves.

In this last election the oddest combinations have taken place for the second ballots, in the various parts of the Empire, and within different States. There was no uniformity of action as to coming to a compromise between Conservative and Liberal, or Liberal and Social Democrat, or Centre and any other party, as against some supposed common enemy who was to be ousted from his insufficient majority by a subsequent alliance between otherwise discordant groups, or who wanted to have his insufficient majority increased to an absolute one by the addition of the votes of one of the defeated candidates whose friends finally choose the 'lesser evil.'

To some extent these necessary, but sometimes rather sordid, transactions are made all the more difficult through the very existence

of separate States—with 'Home Rule' Legislatures of their own. Political development has, in them, gone so far in a centrifugal sense that the nation has been sadly split up and the public mind too much divided into merely local concerns and issues. Those who praise the alleged excellent 'Home Rule' arrangements of the German Empire forget that in reality they are the evil inheritance of our old national misfortunes.

In the older constitution of the Empire there was virtually more unity. The several Dukes, as they were simply called, were mere officials of the Empire, deposable by the central authority—that is, by the elective King, or Kaiser. It was during foreign complications and wars that these Dukes gradually made themselves semi-independent.

After the Thirty Years' War, which ruined the country, they exercised almost sovereign power as *Landesherren*. In consequence of the Napoleonic wars they made themselves downright 'sovereigns.' Any kind of real unity was then gone; a mere confederation of dynasties—several dozens in point of fact—remaining as a common bond. This state of things, though altered now to some extent, still reacts on the present political situation. It renders the task of an effective plan of campaign against 'personal government' in the central authority all the harder. This is a state of things which Englishmen may well consider, when being told that Germany, with her many dynasties and her separate legislatures, is a proper example to follow.

Irrespective of this baneful influence of a so-called 'Home Rule' state of things, on the life of the nation at large, I must confess that the huckstering at the second ballots does not strike me as an ideal institution. It generally goes, in Germany, under the name of *Kuh-Handel* (cow-bargain). It often brings out the worst symptoms of intrigue and political immorality. So it has, as above shown, done in the present instance.

I hold it to be by far better to make every voter feel that the struggle must be concentrated on a single issue, and that he and those thinking with him should, from the beginning, do their best to win the day by manly effort. The so-called *Zähl-Kandidaten* —men who are only put forward in order to find out the strength of a party or group—have become a perfect nuisance in Germany. So have the shuffling tricks of those who dabble in the *Kuh-Handel*. They either lead their own contingent as allies into an enemy's camp, from spite against another adversary; or they induce their own men to desist from voting at all at a second ballot, so as to give a chance to another candidate, whom they really detest with all their heart, but whom they wish to use as a means of spiting one still more deeply hated. All this does not make for political honesty.

VII

A 'block' is now formed, of various groups of Liberals and Conservatives, who, from patriotic motives, can give Government a sufficient majority in matters concerning the defensive strength of the country. This does not mean that the Liberals and Radicals have to be, or ought to be, simply at that Government's order. They must decide each case according to its merits.

In his speeches the Imperial Chancellor evidently wished for a combination of the Conservatives and the Liberals in such cases, but still cast a curious side-glance at the Centre. This was not the right way of strengthening the Progressist efforts. It must, however, be confessed that a Radical Berlin paper forgot, in its criticism, that Prince Bülow, being dependent on the Emperor, who can undo him in a moment, is not able to go beyond a certain line. The Chancellor, nevertheless, gave a hint, in his usual oratorical style, to the Liberals, by saying: 'In order to make music, there must be musicians.' In other words, he called for a Progressist orchestra, whom he might lead. The Berlin paper referred to answered: 'Great composers have never waited for their orchestra. Real statesmen know how to create important movements.'

But seeing that an Imperial Chancellor is appointed by the Crown, and that there is no Ministerial responsibility in the Reichstag, Prince Bülow has clearly not a free hand. The nation itself, by its own Progressist spokesmen, must work out its own salvation. '*Selbst ist der Mann!*'—that well-known good German maxim—must be the guiding principle. Ministerial responsibility, extended parliamentary rights, have to be claimed, as the least reforms, whilst looking forward to larger possibilities in the future. If Social Democrats will aid in that work, all the better. It would certainly be better than to fling in the face of the most advanced men, who willingly work also for social Reforms, the charge of their being, together with the Conservatives, 'one reactionary mass.' Such accusations only make for militarist and bureaucratic reaction.

Another word of necessary admonition. Any attempt from abroad of dictating to the German nation as to its right of looking to its own security on land or at sea, will have a fatal effect. Even in a Liberal London paper it was recently said that the creation of a strong fleet is an 'un-German' enterprise. History itself—witness our Hansa—disproves the assertion. I recollect too well how, in days gone by, any proposal of amelioration in English State affairs was always denounced here, by arch-reactionists, as 'un-English.' That word is scarcely used now any longer.

The French fleet is superior to that of Germany. So was the Russian Navy until lately, and it is now being rebuilt with the money of the French ally of Czardom. Almost all nations of any importance

are strengthening their naval armaments. Japan does so. The United States of America are doing the same, though for what purpose, being in no danger of attack, nobody could say. Germany still ranks fifth only in strength at sea; yet she is exposed to manifold dangers, and has to look to the safety of her increasing over-sea trade.

Will anyone say that the increase of a navy is un-French, un-Russian, un-American, un-Japanese? If words of that kind were used, the answers would quickly come in rather unpleasant terms.

Language held by a late Lord of the British Admiralty as to the necessity of 'smashing a certain navy in the North Sea before even people knew that there was a declaration of war,' has made a deep impression in Germany—not in the way of fear, but of greater readiness for preparing against a possible danger. The revelations of M. Delcassé have added to that feeling. He asserted, uncontradicted, that '100,000 English troops had been promised to him for a landing in Schleswig-Holstein' in a certain eventuality! When it was seen that even in a Social Democratic organ of this country the return to office of M. Delcassé—who had laid a plan of attack against Germany, and who, therefore, was overthrown by the prudent and wise action of Socialist Republican leaders in France—was repeatedly wished for, and that those French Socialists were blamed here by English comrades, the impression in Germany grew still deeper.

I mention all this from a sincere wish of seeing peace and goodwill upheld and promoted between Germany and England, as well as between Germany and France. To threaten Germans with the British trident is the best means of furthering the cause of 'personal government' among them, and of hampering the efforts of men who want to make an end of that nuisance for the sake of greater freedom. A nation's independence being its first natural concern, there will always be a rapid rally round its defender, whoever he may be. If German freemen are to set out for 'riding down' reactionary tendencies at home, they must not be menaced from abroad.

Let this not be forgotten by those who talk so loudly about the desirability of overthrowing Imperial absolutism, and who have even gone to the strange length of describing the adherents of the Pope's personal government as true defenders of liberty, whilst picturing as 'most moderate reformers' a party which in their own country they load with abuse.

KARL BLIND.

WOMEN AND POLITICS

A REPLY

THE writer of the article on 'Women and Politics,' in the February number of this Review, claims to speak for a 'great though silent multitude of women,' who shrink from their own enfranchisement because their already burdened strength would not be equal to the duties and responsibilities of voting at parliamentary elections. She claims exemption as the special privilege of weakness, and a concession to what she conceives to be the retiring, unworldly nature of a large number of women. And if it is argued that, if women were enfranchised, no woman could possibly be forced to vote against her will, we are met with the unanswerable assertion that 'any woman could, of course, abstain from voting, but would this shelter her from being canvassed for her vote?' Alas, that no one tries to shelter us from canvassing other people, a far more unpleasant task!

As a simple matter of justice, it does not seem fair, or even reasonable, that the height of one personal intellectual ambition should be enforced as the legal limit of another person's activity. It may be that 'nuns fret not at their convent's narrow room;' but surely that is no reason why we should all be shut up in cells. I do not say there are not many who would prefer to have 'protecting barriers between them and the rough outer world,' and who are only troubled and alienated by any appeal to their sympathies from the wider life of the nation, and the monotonous and involved issues of our present industrial struggle. The controversy is a very ancient one. There have been contemplative orders, and hermits, and enthusiasts, in all ages, who have consciously limited their sphere of action and shut out the business of the world, that they may the better pursue their own ideal of holiness and right living. I do not wish to undervalue the beauty of Miss Stephen's ideal of gentleness, piety, and devotion. But there is still a place in the world and a need for the sterner virtues, the more adventurous spirits. 'Honour, anger, valour, fire,' were the qualities that Stevenson exulted over in his wife. 'She was,' he says, 'steel-true and blade-straight.' And surely, even in this domesticated generation there are some whose hearts will respond to the ring of those brave words.

Patient Grizzel may have her admirers, but who would not prefer to meet Christina of Sweden, or even Catherine de Médicis, or Maria Theresa, or Queen Elizabeth, or any other of the great stateswomen of the past. Indeed, there are many people who would go so far as to feel more interest in Catherine of Russia, in spite of her indefensible moral attitude. Sir Walter Scott, with all his enchantments, could not make a heroine of the fair but passive Rowena. Who does not remember how, in their first youthful reading of *Ivanhoe*, they wept over the sorrows of the fierce Rebecca, and skipped the parts about the mild and amiable Saxon lady. And while there are lovers of romance and poetry still left among us, there will be many who find their ideal of a woman's character in the heroic soul and indomitable will of the *Antigone* of Sophocles. 'Yet remember in women, too, dwells the spirit of battle,' says Orestes in the play, and some of us are unregeneratedly proud that this is still one of the profound facts of human nature.

But there is another side to this question. However unpleasant or wearisome the idea of political activity may be, and probably is, to some women, as it is to some men, this distaste, founded on a peculiarity of temperament, must not blind our eyes to the wide and deep issues involved. In this work-a-day world, when women, as women, are in no way sheltered from the severity of the industrial struggle, it is idle to hold up to them as women an ideal of intellectual aloofness and seclusion. Miss Stephen speaks for those who 'dread the suffrage,' retiring, well-to-do people who fear change and exertion, and on whom the present industrial condition does not press heavily in practical life. Without answering her arguments in detail, I would appeal to her and others on behalf of those women who have something more serious to dread than the intellectual effort of voting at an election. Against the fastidious shrinking of the women who would feel their own enfranchisement too great a strain on their nerves, I would set the really urgent and practical suffering of another 'very great and very silent multitude,' the multitude of the women workers. The five millions of women who depend on their own exertions for their daily bread cannot afford the luxury of nun-like seclusion.

There is no possibility of shelter or protection for them. They are, whether they like it or no, in the thick of the world's battle, and the very disqualification that Miss Stephen welcomes as a kind of privilege is a source of disablement and extreme weakness in industrial warfare. It is a fact of common observation among people interested in economic questions, that in every trade where women are employed (with one or two local exceptions such as the weavers in Lancashire) they are paid at a much lower rate than men can earn for doing the same work, or work of a slightly different nature requiring the same amount of skill. This is no question of men doing more work than women, because this rule holds good of trades where piecework rates

are given. Nowadays this question assumes a very serious aspect, because the old industrial conditions have changed, and it is a fact that, from one cause or another—the illness, drunkenness, or desertion, so lamentably common in our great towns—many and many a woman is forced into the position of breadwinner for others beside herself. Now it is no easy matter to keep several people on what is considered a quite good wage for a woman, 15*s.* or 20*s.* a week; but when we come to the multitude of smaller and lesser skilled trades that swarm in all industrial centres, such as tailoring, fancy-box-making, shirt-making, folding and sewing, clay-pipe finishing, machining, and dozens of others, the rates in most cases are so low that the workers are never far removed from the starvation level, wages of 6*s.* or 7*s.* a week being the limit of the earnings of hundreds and thousands of women.

In the Potteries from 7*s.* to 10*s.* is a very usual wage for women, and the Cradley Heath chain-makers earn as little as 5*s.* or 6*s.* a week. The condition of things that has brought such a large body of workers to the extremes of poverty has also had its effect upon the professional world. Roughly speaking, it may be said that the present position of women works out in the industrial market in this way. Educated and qualified women are able to earn as much as skilled working men. The salary of many high-school teachers is no larger than the male spinner's wage of 2*l.* a week, and often less than the wages of tailors' cutters. The wages of skilled working women at their best are about the same as those of unskilled working men, and at their worst a good deal lower; whilst the wages of the unskilled working women, varying as they do between 5*s.* and 10*s.* a week, have no parallel in the ranks of the men workers.

The only exceptions to this category are cases of special demands or special individual successes, as the special demand among some classes of women has enabled women doctors to keep up their fees, in face of the fact that public recognition and honour is almost exclusively a masculine monopoly.

The power of amusing and entertaining the public is so rare, and in such demand, that it is paid for irrespective of sex. Thus popular novelists, actresses, dancers, opera-singers, and music-hall artistes are able to command wholly exceptional industrial and economic conditions. But these are the small minority, the few who succeed.

The universal low rate of wages is not traceable to any lack of organising power amongst women. As elementary school teachers, men and women do the same work, their hours are the same, they have to go through the same training and pass the same examinations. Nobody even suggests that women are not as good teachers as men. And yet under every education committee in England there is a carefully calculated scale of salaries by which teachers of every

grade are provided for; and in all cases, from pupil teachers up to headmasters and headmistresses, men are paid so much extra for being men, and women so much less for being women. And this in spite of the fact that there are 30,000 women members on the books of the National Union of Teachers. Again there are 96,000 women in the cotton trade unions, and yet Miss Collet (Board of Trade) gives the average of women's wages at 14*s.* a week, a rate practically unknown amongst skilled men workers. With unskilled men or women, owing to the comparative lack of value of the individual to the employer, Trade Unionism is never a great success, because people always know that, however large may be the number of the dissatisfied, the employer can easily fill their places at a moment's notice.

The laws of supply and demand go far to regulate, in normal cases, the rate of wages. But in the case of women's labour these natural economic forces have not had fair play. Artificial restrictions, that have narrowed down the sphere of women's activity, have resulted in the overcrowding of the few professions and trades open to them. Thus the natural supply of women's labour, arbitrarily forced into a few channels, has, in every case, largely exceeded the demand, with the inevitable consequence of a reduction of wages. When it is proposed to 'shelter' women from some sphere of paid activity, as, for instance, in the case of the barmaids, it should always be remembered that every 'protection' of this kind increases the competition, and thereby lowers the rate of wages in the other trades where they are employed. But it is in those industries carried on under Government supervision that the direct industrial need of women for the franchise is perhaps most apparent. In the evidence before the Royal Commission to inquire into the wages of postal servants, it was very clearly shown how rigidly the principle of a sex basis for wages is adhered to, and how severely the able but unlucky women clerks in the Post Office are fined for not being men.

The post of woman clerk is the highest in the service open to women by public competition. Candidates for these appointments are examined in English composition, geography, Latin, French, and German (two of these three); English history, algebra, shorthand (two of these three). The minimum salary for this work is 55*l.* a year, the maximum 100*l.* The maximum salary of the second division of male clerks (lower grade) is 250*l.*, whilst the higher grade of the second division of men are able to earn up to 350*l.* The disparity of salary holds good though men and women may be doing very similar, and in some cases identical, work.

Again, in the Pimlico Clothing Factory, 15*s.* per week is considered a good wage for a skilled woman worker, whilst, in answer to a question in the House of Commons last session, it was ascertained that 23*s.* per week is the lowest sum given to the most unskilled man labourer.

It is an undoubted advantage to choose your employers by popular election, and it is easy to see how the men are able to bring pressure through the House of Commons to secure a fair rate of wages for themselves in the Government factories; whilst the whole weight and prestige of the Government as the largest employer of labour in the country goes to set an example of underpayment and sub-contracting amongst women. The effects of this evil extend far beyond the 30,000 women actually employed by Government, and react on the whole of the labour market. All local bodies are bound to keep down their expenses as much as they can. Government low rates have given them reason and justification for adjusting their wages to the Government standard; and directly one private employer, seeking naturally to buy labour at the cheapest rate, begins to follow the public example, other employers are at once bound by the laws of competition, if they do not wish to be ruined, to reduce the expenses of production in the same way.

The whole question of the relation of industry and politics is too involved to enter into here. But it is nevertheless true that, whether we like it or not, since the days of Lord Shaftesbury's Factory Act we have seen a great change, and a gradual shifting of the ground on which industrial questions are fought out. Technical difficulties relating to obscure processes in different trades are now national difficulties decided in Parliament. Working men have realised this, and the great sums of Trade Union money that in old days were kept exclusively for industrial objects, are now devoted unhesitatingly to parliamentary purposes. The employers also have their political organisations and methods of attack and defence. It is not to be wondered at if, in the clash of powerful conflicting interests, the grievances and claims of those millions of workers who are not allowed to make their voices heard should be ignored. The late Lord Salisbury said that the condition of the working women of England was a 'blot and a menace to our civilisation.' Miss Stephen, on the other hand, congratulates women on possessing the key to men's reverence. It may be that she is right, that men reverence 'sheltered' women; but this I do know, that there are many hundreds of thousands of half-starved wage-earning women who are seeking yet in vain the key to men's justice.

EVA GORE-BOOTH.

THE DANCE AND THE PLASTIC ARTS IN ANCIENT GREECE

THE innumerable choreographic scenes recorded in the sculpture and in the vase-painting of ancient Greece show how considerably the plastic arts were influenced by the art of the dance, and it is manifest how the familiar spectacle of dancing, when at its best, could develop, in a greater degree than any other physical exercise, a sense of that beauty of form and movement and action which is seen and felt throughout all Greek art. That the dance was one of the great formative powers of art generally in Greece is beyond doubt; the silent beauty of every statue or vase speaks eloquently of the powers that moulded it, but of none more clearly than of the inspiring influence of that spirit of dancing which animated the Greeks, and made them move in beautiful and rhythmical action. Indeed, the influence of the dance on the various arts in Greece is not to be measured; the lithe figure of Terpsichore seems to flit everywhere through the thought and life of the Greeks, and the lightness, quickness, and agility of a good dancer are amongst the qualities which, both mentally and physically, specially characterise the thinker, the warrior, the poet, and the artist of ancient Hellas. But no arts were so directly and obviously influenced by the dance as sculpture and painting, and none were so intimately connected with the dance. The cause of their affinity must, however, be sought in something far deeper than the external characteristics wherein the 'living sculpture' may be said to resemble the other, and the ties that bind them together are rooted deep down in the bodily and mental nature of the Greeks, arising from those instincts out of which the whole religious and æsthetic world of Paganism was evolved. Recognise what these instincts were; what the nature of the civilisation which grew therefrom; and the development and connection of the arts which could best express one of the dominating feelings and ideas of that civilisation, of its religion, and art, the dance and the plastic arts, appear as but the natural and inevitable outcome of the whole great system of life, integral parts of it, necessary and concordant notes in the harmony of the universal order of things in Greece; united, in being the most characteristic and perfect expressions of the fundamental element of

all art, the recognition of beauty, apart from any didactic purpose, of the beauty which is sufficient in itself; similar, in striving to attain the same ideal of form and co-ordinate action; in having the same subject matter wherewith to work; but, above all, in being consummate expressions of the cult of physical beauty, the beauty of the human body, which takes the foremost place in the order of Greek feelings and ideas. In studying Greek life and thought, one cannot fail to see that the passion for human beauty was, in reality, the dominating feeling of all the ancient Greek world; their religion encouraged it, their art glorified it, and their life was one long example of it; this unconscious and subtle worship of their own bodily beauty was part of the air they breathed; it was the spirit which animated them. They themselves were the living expressions of the idea, with the care and attention they gave to their appearance, with the daily tribute paid to the body in religion and life, with the games and festivals wherein the male beauty and strength of Greece were displayed, and in the frank and passionate admiration bestowed on those who possessed great natural advantages. Plato himself sanctioned the love of the mere physical beauty, hoping that such love might lead to the comprehension of a higher and more spiritual beauty; and the main charge of later generations against the 'Pagan' was his love of beauty, and his worship of the idol which now lies shattered and broken; the ideal of perfect manhood and womanhood, the idol whom they worshipped only because it was beautiful, believing that 'the beautiful is greater than the good, for it includes it.' And of this cult of beauty, the dance and the plastic arts are the most typical and perfect expressions.

The dance is the most corporeal of the arts, and the very reason for its existence is to display the body in beautiful attitudes, and to exhibit its beauty and grace in rhythmical motions. The dance seeks to show every beauty of line and form to the greatest advantage; and, in order that an 'harmonious motion should be diffused everywhere,' as Plato has it, in his description of good dancing, the turn of the head, the movement and gesture of arm and hand, have to be studied carefully and well; the folds of the drapery, all the intricacies of dress and undress, being of paramount importance in the general scheme of beauty and harmony. In this way the dance, dealing so obviously and directly with the beauty of the human form, came to be very closely and extensively associated with the passion of love. The whole religious and intellectual system of the Greeks was in nowise hostile or antagonistic to anything that was natural, and therefore the most important division of *orchesis* was probably that connected with the divinities who personified love and the reproductive forces of nature in general, and it took almost the foremost place in certain of their most sacred rites and ceremonies. This relation of the dance to Aphrodite was natural and inevitable; it was

in perfect harmony with their view of life, and arose from the veneration and sanctification of all natural things. In all primitive and savage stages of society we find that the dance is very intimately connected with erotic celebrations, and the Greek poet who would have us believe that it came at the beginning of all things, being 'brought to light together with Eros,' was only anticipating, by a few centuries, as poets often do, what we know to-day to be a scientific fact. The dance not only originated with Eros, but remained associated with him for many long centuries, and with its pantomimic and expressive qualities, its rhythmical and harmonious attitudes, expressed all the thoughts and feelings prompted by the love-god. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Greeks, in whom the feeling of instinctive life was so great, should have worshipped Eros in all his aspects, and cultivated in his honour the art of the dance, which Eros likes best because it increases and displays the beauty of that which quickest kindles his flame in the human heart. The dance is then the art belonging *par excellence* to the Greeks, expressing in living figures what the plastic arts express otherwise, differing from them not so much in quality as in quantity, in nature as in substance, consisting of a series of beautiful actions of which sculpture and painting could represent but one, the single, fleeting moment caught and held in the marble or the painted presentation. And the more one studies the plastic arts of the Greeks, the more does it become apparent that the passion for human beauty is, in truth, the mainspring of their art; they were the first to strive after a true and voluminous representation of organic form in art, and in the dawn of their artistic activity they broke away from the traditional art of the older civilisations by whom they were influenced —from the art wherein vegetable and animal life was pre-eminent— to bestow the force and activity of their youthful genius on the representation of the human form, and in the declining days of their art their very weakness was the over-refinement, finish, and softening of the lines and beauty of the figure. They aimed at the utmost and fullest development of all the possibilities of beauty, embracing all types and aspects of it, fearlessly attempting to represent it in the most awe-inspiring and lofty forms, as in that of their Zeus, in the purest and noblest, like that of Athene, and so along an endless scale, till even the coarse beauty of the animal life of the human being is typified in the goat-footed satyrs.

The dance and the plastic arts are then, psychologically, as well as historically, inseparable in Greece.

In being expressions of the same thought and feeling they are psychologically and fundamentally akin, and bound together; but only when we realise how and why the idea, whereof the dance and the plastic arts were the consummate expressions, was the dominating one in Greece, shall we form a proper estimate of their importance and interest in Greek life. So wide is the spiritual gulf which separates

us from the Greeks, so opposed our conception of life to theirs, that the task of interpreting their art is a hopeless one, unless we are prepared to enter sympathetically into their ways of thought, to feel with them, live with them, and forgetting the things we have been taught for so many centuries, divest ourselves of the religious ideas and feelings which came into the world when the light of Greece was spent. Their art can be intelligently studied only by gaining an insight into the religious thought which inspired it, and its import fully grasped only through a sympathy with the religious enthusiasm which moved Greece to sing its soul in art. We must, as it were, worship their gods and believe their myths, and go back if possible to the remote time when man lived naturally the life of the instincts, senses, and imagination, when everything within him and without was personified in a god, and when all nature was conceived as a great poem, full of wonderful beings and their wonderful deeds. It is only by so doing, that the art which sprang from religion and along with it can be truly comprehended; when we realise the difference in thought and feeling, in religious conception, we can understand the function of the dance in Greek life, and its relation to the plastic arts, and then only shall we clearly perceive why, with the vital changes in all these things, the art of the dance must inevitably have degenerated and undergone great changes, and fallen from the high rank it held in the religious worship and the art of the past. Only when we realise that the dance was perhaps the art which could best express the religious feeling and enthusiasm of the Greeks, shall we feel how far removed from theirs is the religion which actively opposes precisely that idea so beautifully expressed by means of the dance and the plastic arts.

The Greek gods could be propitiated through the harmonious and rhythmical postures and motion of the dance, and their temples were adorned with statues and paintings of human beings whose only claim to holiness was beauty, and they must therefore have been of a vastly different nature from that of the gods whose disciples bade us despise the beauty of that body which they looked upon as merely the 'mortal habitation of an immortal soul,' a thing to be loathed and trampled on, a fleshy net woven by the powers of darkness to catch and enmesh the spirit of man. The gods of Greece were, in the first instance, the great powers of nature embodied and personified in human form; the sun, the air, the sea and the earth were gods, the varying and ever-changing aspects of all the natural phenomena in the different elements being described and symbolised in the myth spun round each god; the change of seasons, the unseen powers of life and death, the stirring impulses that lie deep down in man's nature, all things which they saw in the external world and all things which they felt within themselves were sacred to the Greeks, and were shaped into a human form that they could venerate. Their god was 'one with the blowing wind, and one with the falling rain,' sang Sophokles, and Dionysos imaged

the enthusiasm which fills the heart of those who are susceptible to the excitement of wine, or love, or glory; and Demeter's sorrow symbolised the sadness and weariness which permeate the spirit of man at the sight of all dying things; and so, out of themselves and their impressions they made their gods, and so with their own tears and laughter, wove their gods' life drama. The character of the race having formed that of the gods, the Greeks endowed these gods with their own physical appearance and characteristics, giving them bodies like unto their own, only more beautiful and perfect, and attributing to them all the *joie de vivre* which they themselves so keenly felt. Reversing the order of Genesis, they made gods in their image, after their likeness, thus bringing upon themselves the bitter reproach of their own thinkers and philosophers in a later period, the reproach uttered by Xenophanes: 'But, of a truth, if oxen or lions had hands, and could draw with their hands, and make what men make, then horses like unto horses, and oxen like unto oxen would both paint the images of gods, and shape their bodies also after the similitude of their own limbs.' And their gods were, after all, but magnified personalities; retaining, however, something in their human form of the element or power in nature which they embodied; some of the sun's gold woven into Apollo's hair, or the blue of the sky mingled in Athene's eyes, something of the vine's sinewy grace in the strong and supple limbs of Dionysos, and the mystery and sorrow of earth stamped on Demeter's brow. The gods being thus ideals become idols, the mode of worship was shaped accordingly: religion consisting, as it were, to a great extent, of the worship of nature and the instinctive life of man, much of the religious duties seemed to be no more than man's tribute to these powers; duties accomplished by 'life, the mere living,' by the natural joy and sorrow of human existence. If the Greeks were profoundly religious, it is probably because it was not too difficult to be religious: those who loved paid homage unto Aphrodite by their mere love; the chaste found favour with Artemis; if they were but natural and true to themselves, not exceeding the bounds erected by nature herself, they were certain to serve some god, well and worthily.

To the Greek gods, therefore, it was the constant glorification and veneration of the human body, and not its mortification, that was pleasing; not in starving or inhibiting the natural impulses, nor in reviling any of the gifts, spiritual or physical, which have been given us, could they be served.

To them 'le bonheur est innocent et la joie permise,' and man, with his beauty and joy, the richest offering to set before the gods; his love, the most fragrant incense wherewith to perfume Olympos; and the praise of Zeus's fairest and most perfect creation, the beautiful human form, the fittest subject to be sung in poems, to be immortalised in the plastic arts, and to be embodied in the living dance.

It now becomes clear how the idea expressed in the dance and in the plastic arts occupied almost the foremost place in the order of Greek thought and feeling; how it permeated the whole of Greek life, and ran, like a living thread, always visible, through the brilliant warp and woof of their intellectual and emotional life. The dance and the plastic arts, cultivated as extensively and in such a manner as they were in Greece, belong essentially to a nation and a people who apprehended the beauty and significance of the human form as of all earthly things the best; who knew how much it could express, and who, notwithstanding this, were aware of its limitations, who excelled and achieved because they 'knew how to *live*.' And in Nietzsche's words, 'For that end it is necessary to remain bravely at the surface, the fold, the skin, to worship appearance, to believe in forms, in tones, in words, in the whole Olympos of appearance!' This the Greeks undoubtedly did, in theory and practice; and the result leads to the conviction that the Greeks, in being 'profoundly superficial,' possessed more wisdom, whether consciously or unconsciously, than many are willing to grant to the 'Pagan.'

The dance and the plastic arts are also connected historically, and throughout the history of Greece stand in close and direct relationship to one another; they are very similar in external characteristics, and evidence of the influence, both direct and indirect, of the dance or the plastic arts is by no means lacking. The dance, in ancient Greece, was of an entirely different character from the modern art of dancing, and, by both its nature and function in the religious and secular life of the Greeks, became one of the most fecund sources of inspiration to the painter and the sculptor, and no other form of physical exercise, save perhaps athletics, seems to have attracted and impressed them in as powerful a manner as this. It was one of the most characteristic of Greek institutions: from the earliest time it formed an important part of the religious worship, much of the ritual consisting of dramatic action and gesture; choral and military dances were practised for both religious and governmental purposes; whilst, as a means of artistic expression, the dance ranked with poetry and music, and its place in the drama is known to have been very prominent, tragedy and comedy having, indeed, probably been evolved from choral and Bacchic dances. The dance was perhaps the most widely spread and prevalent custom in the private and daily life of the citizen. But the art which could thus occupy so large a place in Greek life, and satisfy the taste of a people of such fine artistic sensibility, did not bear much resemblance to the meaningless musical gymnastic and senseless evolutions of modern dancing. It was, above all, in Greece, the art of *expressive gesture* brought to the utmost perfection: the gesture used in conjunction with music and poetry, interpreting and elucidating the spoken word of the poem, aiding verbal expression, and bringing forth the spirit of the music. It was

like all dancing, at its origin, entirely pantomimic, and, by means of rhythmical gesture and pace, strove to interpret and render all the emotions. The rise and development of symbolical and conventional gesture is one of the most interesting studies in the history of peoples, and reveals not only the meaning and motive of many curious habits and customs, but also the psychological and physiological characteristics of a race. Like all primitive peoples, the Greeks, from the earliest period, sought to express their feelings by means of gestures; and from irregular and indefinite gesticulations, an art of rhythmical gestures was evolved with certain meanings attached to them, till a whole emotional phase could be conveyed through the mere uplifting of an arm, the turn of the hand or the head, or the beat of the foot; and so an extensive system was developed, and used in artistic dancing, in religious dancing and ritual, whereof the gestures were sometimes of great beauty and perfection. Simpler than poetry or music in its immediate appeal to the eye, the gesture of the dance conveys more eloquently whatever the dancer desires to express. It is not always possible to interpret the gestures of the Greek dance, the meaning of many being obscure, whilst some, like the cult-titles of the gods, seem to be survivals from a more primitive stage of culture, having been preserved merely through a spirit of conservatism and a reverence for old customs. But the Greeks were fortunately endowed with an inherent sense of proportion and beauty, and never allowed their gestures to become mere formal signs, unnatural and stiff, into which conventionalised gestures tend to degenerate; whether used for religious or other purposes, they retained that nice balance between nature and art, and, as in all their artistic work, the Greeks, in this, combined naturalism with an art which but enhanced the beauty of nature whilst toning down and doing away with the crudeness and roughness of an excessive realism. Their gestures, reflected in art, have the spontaneity of nature, but gain greater beauty and strength by the reserve and moderation, the smoothness, as it were, of art. There is restraint and orderly arrangement even in the seeming abandonment of the Bacchic dances; simplicity and naturalness in the most solemn and significant gestures of the staid 'dances of order,' as Plato terms them, or in those of the funereal ritual. In being thus entirely of an expressive character, the Greek dance differs fundamentally from modern dancing. According to Lucian's account, in *De Saltatione*, of perfect dancing and good dancers, in the Greek sense, the dancer should be a person of the most varied accomplishments, possessing in the highest degree all intellectual and artistic gifts, a thorough knowledge of all those myths and fables and historical incidents in the literature of his country, which are susceptible to a choreographic interpretation, a nature quick to respond to every feeling and emotion, and the greatest possible experience in the emotional life, whilst every limb of his body must be

trained to obey the command of the will, and aid, with ease and grace, the dramatic expression of the dance. It is doubtful whether all dancers in antiquity attained such a degree of perfection and culture; nevertheless, it is certain that the Greeks, in their dance, did not separate body and soul, as we do in modern dancing, but strove to subordinate the actions of the body to the guiding and ruling power of the intellect, and to give them harmony and grace only inasmuch as these could aid and express the intellectual or emotional phase actually performed; they used gesture and attitude especially as an aid to expression. In Lucian's words the 'actions of the dance should show the quickness of the thought, at the same time as the quickness of the bodily movements'; and besides certain natural advantages, such as good proportion, the proper height, neither short nor tall, neither stout nor thin, the dancer should undergo a most rigorous training to attain suppleness, strength and grace, ease, and ability to move the body conformably to the rhythm of the music, whatever it may be. By training alone can one learn to dance so that the postures and motions of the dance are performed without an appearance of difficulty, and only in obtaining this facility will the dancer become graceful; if the effort is visible, the grace and 'composure of parts' is destroyed. Although little is known concerning the actual training of the Greek dancer, we may surmise that it was of a kind to ensure perfect proficiency in the art, without causing any abnormal muscular development. Nowhere, on the vases or elsewhere, do we see the abnormal development of the modern dancer, though the *technique* of Greek *orchesis* was certainly sufficiently elaborate and thorough to enable the dancers to execute steps and movements of the utmost difficulty. Besides all this bodily perfection and training of the professional dancer, which would naturally appeal beyond everything to the artist, the function of the dance in Greece was of a kind to impress and influence those who unconsciously seek and find the beauty of line and form in every object of vision. The religious dances so numerous and varied: the Pæan, with its 'noble and lofty steps,' in honour of Apollo; the dramatic representations at the Eleusinian mysteries, and the dancers' descriptive postures, telling of Demeter's sorrow; the Pyrrhic, wherein the youths were taught to use their weapons gracefully and rhythmically, rousing an inextinguishable patriotic enthusiasm in the hearts of the spectators; the countless Hyporchemata,—or dances expressing by gesture the words of a poem,—in which all the fables of Greek mythology were told; the innumerable measures trodden in honour of Dionysos: all this train of glad and sad dancers, upon whom the artist looked every day, became to him a constant source of inspiration, and an ever-present lesson in movement, posture, and expressiveness, the qualities specially associated with Greek art. It is highly probable that the artists made use of professional dancers as models, although direct evidence of this

is difficult to obtain. The women with whom Greek artists came into daily contact, the women they could see freely and converse with, were of the class out of which came the flute-players and dancing-girls, and therefore it is not unlikely that these women, with their studied poses, their training, their art of costume, should have served as models. M. Emmanuel, who, in his *Danse Grecque Antique*, has made a careful study of the technique of the Greek dance, believes that many of the winged Victories of later Greek art are dancing-girls, and he points out that most of these figures are undoubtedly in choreographic attitudes; he thinks, too, that Paonios, in making his statue of the flying Victory, was inspired by one of the dances, so numerous in Greece, in which the action of the flowing veil, and the drapery clinging to the figure, were specially important. All this, however, is merely conjectural, and we can never know with certainty whether Greek art was influenced in this particular way by the dance.

But, from the earliest time in Greece, dancing scenes were represented in sculpture and painting, thus showing how high it ranked in the estimation of painters and sculptors even then, and proving, too, that the dance already occupied a foremost place in Greek religion and life. As far back as the pre-Homeric days, the dance seems to have influenced art, and Homer tells us how Hephaistos, when representing the principal occupations of Greek life on Achilles' shield, did not forget the dance, and wrought thereon a dance of youths and maidens with 'their hands upon each other's wrists,' as we see them on bas-reliefs and vases. 'And now,' sings Homer, 'would they run round with deft feet exceeding lightly . . . and now anon they would run in lines to meet each other. . . . And a great company stood round the lovely dance in joy.' This picturesque dance has been used as a *motif* by all Greek artists, and it is of the greatest decorative value on the round vases or on the long lines of frieze and mural decorations. Another dancing scene, represented by a sculptor belonging almost to the realm of mythology, is also mentioned by Homer. Daidalos, the 'father of Greek sculpture,' although said, by Homer, to have devised a dance or dancing-place for Ariadne at Cnossus . . . 'like unto that which once on broad Cnossus Daidalos devised for Ariadne of the lovely locks,' . . . carved a plastic representation of a dance in honour of the Cretan goddess Ariadne, which Pausanias mentions as a 'relief in white marble,' to be seen still in his day. Indeed, many of the principal works of art in Greece were directly concerned with the dance and dancers, and the fragmentary knowledge we possess of the works of the archaic school shows how extensively the dance was used as a subject for plastic representation from the earliest time. The 'Sosandra' of Kalamis, supposed to have stood at the entrance to the Acropolis at Athens, is spoken of by Lucian as though she were a dancer 'with beautiful ankles and rhythmical motion.' Phidias carved winged Victories in the attitude of the dance on the throne

of his colossal statue of Zeus at Olympia; the 'dancing maidens of Sparta,' a work of 'flawless precision' as Pliny calls it, by Kallimachos, was amongst the most famous works of art in antiquity: and so, one might count numberless dancing scenes by the most humble and the greatest Greek artists.

The figures used in building, as supports, called Caryatides are believed to have been inspired by the maidens of Caryae in Laconia, who danced in honour of Artémis, with baskets on their heads. Many tales are told concerning these maidens and their 'Caryatis' dance, and Pausanias is extremely interesting and illuminative on the subject. The ease and grace with which they carry their heavy burden undoubtedly give the impression that the weight on the head is merely that of the offerings which they bring in their 'Calathus,' or basket of osier: their rich festal drapery, and their majestic bearing, fit them particularly for the imposing and responsible position which they occupy in Greek architecture. Caryatides were a favourite subject with many artists: those of Kallimachos, already mentioned as the Spartan dancing maidens, were famous in antiquity; the Erechtheion at Athens had them to support its entablature: Polykleites, Praxiteles, and Skopas made statues of Caryatides, and M. Rayet sees in the well-known dancers of Herculaneum these same maidens who danced at Caryae in Laconia. Other figures in Greek art, which seem to be distinctly those of dancers, are the 'lightly bounding' Nereids, who, with their light draperies and graceful attitudes, might lead one to believe that, in seeking to embody in the form of the 'fair daughters of Nereus' something of the flowing movement of the sea, and, in the drapery, recall the action of the water ruffled by the breeze, the artist could find no better models than the lightly-clad dancers, and their easy, graceful movements, and peradventure the soft breeze playing in their locks and toying with their veils, as it plays and toys with the waves of the sea. On the vase-painting of Greece the direct influence of the dance was incomparable. Almost every vase records a scene of choreographic mimetic: the funereal scenes show the actions and gestures accompanying the 'threnoi' or funereal songs; the animated steps and manly attitudes of the Pyrrhic ornament many vases; the dancing-girls and flute-players enliven the banqueting scenes with their more frivolous dances; a long and motley train of satyrs and mænads reveal the various aspects of the worship of Dionysos; and there are many other dancing scenes, the mimetic import of which is not always clear. The 'veiled dancers' of Tanagra and Myrina, and all that little world of terra-cotta figures, reveal charming and original aspects of the Greek dance.

Throughout all Greek art the influence of the dance is felt, and in the art of no other nation do we see so many representations of dancing scenes. But even where the dance is not actually represented, it seems to have left an unmistakable and indelible trace of its influence, and the

presence of certain elements, belonging essentially to the dance, which are continuous in Greek art, may undoubtedly be attributed to the constant spectacle of the human form in its most beautiful activity or harmonious postures. The distinguishing characteristics of Greek art are, in a subtle way, connected with the dance, and one would almost expect to find them in the works of a people who cultivated the dance so extensively. *Expressiveness* and *movement* are especially associated with the art of the Greeks, and these are, too, the distinctive qualities of their dance.

The Greek sculptors and painters strove, above all things, to make their art expressive, and to give a richer and deeper meaning to the beauty of perfect form, by emotional and intellectual gifts. The dancer aimed, beyond everything, at a knowledge of expressive gesture, and learnt to express, in this way, all shades and grades of emotion and feeling, the number and variety of emotions expressed being, as it were, co-extensive with those of nature herself; in the multiplicity and complexity of the gods of Olympos, in the shadowy realm of nature-gods, who symbolise the vague thoughts and feelings of which we are but half-conscious, the Greek dancer could find material and inspiration for the expression of every feeling, and not a chord of his spiritual or physical nature but might be played upon or touched in honour of a god. And the influence of this constant spectacle of the studied gesture, of the perfectly trained arm and hand, of the gesture expressing every emotion in rhythmical movement, is manifest in all Greek sculpture and painting. But the nature of it is so fine and subtle, that it almost escapes definition: we see it in the absence of the awkward gesture and stiff pose, in the harmony of attitude, in the ease and grace of bearing, in the beauty of the postures, in that delicate combination of naturalness and art, and in the complete elimination of all the ugliness and awkwardness, which often accompany a realism as true as that of Greek art.

Movement is also especially characteristic of Greek art. The Greeks recognised that the figure is at its best in *activity*, rather than at rest, in *movement* of some kind, whether of body or mind, as well as in its capacity of expressing an emotion or a thought. Hence, in all their art, there is a continual striving to represent the figure in motion, and to give the impression of actual movement. The Greeks were the first to be entirely successful in representing *movement*: from the earliest days they had this wonderful power of giving life to everything they touched, and, like Pallas Athene, who came forth fully equipped from the head of Zeus, so did Greek genius come into the world with its life-giving powers already strong and mighty. The figures in Greek art are felt to be living organisms, with all the possibilities of motion, besides the single movement or gesture actually designed by the artist: one feels that the movement represented is, in fact, but a single one in a series, that others have gone before, and that

more are about to follow—that it is mere chance that this particular evanescent gesture and thought, instead of fading away like so many other beautiful gestures or thoughts, should have survived through the centuries which lie between ourselves and the Greeks. They seized, in their art, the psychological moment, as well as the temporal moment: the activity of mind, the thought causing the bodily movement; they seized the most beautiful and significant moment in a series of movements, and caught the most significant moment in the 'stream of consciousness.' Every new movement of the body destroyed a harmony, in the dance, but to create another even more beautiful; and it was this, the most perfect, the moment of nascent activity, that was caught in the art. The movement of all living things, the ever-changing and continuously-moving nature of phenomena—the perpetual flux of Heraclitus—is felt throughout all Greek art, like a great heart pulsating in it, so that one almost expects to see the Victories continue their flight through the air, or the Nereids melt into the waves from which they have just emerged, or the procession on the Parthenon frieze continue its rhythmic march.

And the dance, beyond everything else, could develop in the Greek mind a sense of movement. It would of necessity impart, almost unconsciously, and very subtly, something of its restlessness, its rhythm, and measure to the work of those who are ever susceptible to the slightest impression from the surrounding life. The artist would give something of the dancer's lightness and nimbleness to all his figures; the vision of the human form in its most beautiful activity lingering in his mind, he would, in making his statue or painting his picture, endow the dead substance with all the life and movement of that living form, which had but now passed from out his sight. And something of the dancer's supple grace and rhythmical movement is felt everywhere in Greek art. Their art communicates to us a sense of movement and of intensity of life; their figures might be merely holding back, for a moment only, the breath of life. In the measured and martial march of the warrior, with foot forward for the brisk pace, we seem to feel the rhythm and hear the music of the march; in the solemn procession of the Parthenon frieze, one has this same sense of the measured pace keeping time to a chant: in the frenzied Bacchic scenes, one catches the strains and the impassioned measures of the revellers; in the flying Victories, or the swift Iris, in the whole world of restless, palpitating nymphs and Nereids, the swirling draperies, the transparent clinging garments of the dancers, and their animated steps are transferred with the most delicate touch, unconsciously, from flesh to marble, from the transient, fleeting life to the immortal world of art.

Perhaps the vague term of 'rhythm,' wherewith the Greeks qualified the work of certain artists of antiquity, might express this characteristic movement of their art. It might almost be supposed that the

term 'rhythm' was borrowed from music, poetry, and dancing to express the thing taken from the 'musical arts' by sculpture and painting: that indefinable quality suggested by the term 'frozen music' applied to the plastic arts of Greece. 'Rhythm' in art would seem to mean 'the system of changes producing a constant harmony of the parts of the body when in motion,' and this rhythm, whether in music, in poetry, in the beat of the dancer's foot, or in his gestures and attitudes, this rhythm which belongs so particularly to the Dance and the Plastic Arts, and the harmony which characterises all Greek life and thought, might come to be apprehended as part of the same great system of rhythm and harmony—the harmony of the spheres—which Pythagoras took to be the ruling and guiding law of the universe.

MARCELLE AZRA HINCKS.

EDUCATION, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY[1]

THE term 'elementary education,' though used from time to time before the Education Act of 1870, was undoubtedly brought into general use and given a legal meaning by that Act, the object of which was to 'provide for public elementary education in England and Wales.' Though for many years previously grants from the national purse in aid of education had been given by the Committee of the Privy Council which subsequently became the Board of Education, the proposal to pay for education directly out of the rates was a new thing running counter to many strong prejudices. To meet those prejudices the Act limited the instruction thus to be paid for to that which was absolutely necessary; the teaching offered by the Act to those who presumably could not well afford to pay for it was to be strictly elementary so as not to compete with the higher teaching paid for by the well-to-do out of their own purses.

By the working of this Act of 1870 the term 'secondary education' which had been gradually coming into use acquired a definite meaning; it came to denote all that education below university teaching which was not provided for in the public elementary schools established by the Act or in the voluntary schools which were offering the same elementary education as that given in those schools. Thus the two terms 'elementary education' and 'secondary education' came to bear meanings somewhat different from mere degrees of learning. 'Elementary education' came to mean that kind of education which it is lawful to pay for out of the rates and which therefore must be limited in character, and secondary education all other kinds of education below university teaching, not paid for out of the rates. The distinction became a class distinction, not an educational one.

During the last quarter of the past century elementary education developed rapidly; while secondary education remained for the most part disorganised, it, under the direct influence of public control, became stringently organised. Continuing to be restricted in character, by reason of its legislative conditions it became more and more differen-

[1] Board of Education. Report of the Consultative Committee upon questions affecting Higher Elementary schools.

tiated as a special kind of education, special as to the subjects taught and still more as to the way in which and the extent to which these were taught. The teachers teaching this elementary education became sharply distinguished by their training, by their position, and by the limits of their careers from the teachers of secondary education, so much so that when in course of time a Register of Teachers was established, the elementary teachers, the teachers in elementary schools, were at once and without difficulty placed in a category by themselves, wholly separate from the teachers in all other kinds of schools.

During this development, however, a feeling sprang up, and year by year grew stronger, that this elementary education, as defined by law, though intended for the industrial classes, and defrayed out of rates, because it was supposed to be for the benefit of the industrial classes, was seriously failing in adequately fitting the young of those classes for industrial careers; what was taught in the elementary schools seemed to have no connection with actual industrial life, to be of little or no use when it was brought into the workshop, and otherwise failed to make the learners ready to become skilled and capable workmen and workwomen. Hence arose a demand for what is vaguely and uncertainly known as technical instruction. An effort to supply in the school itself something more than the ordinary school teaching was checked by the Cockerton judgment; an attempt to provide what was needed by the Technical Instruction Act brought about variable but on the whole uncertain and inadequate results; and, though various subsidiary agencies have been employed as aids, the state of elementary education at the present day is such as to have led to the widespread conviction that the system is failing to effect satisfactorily that which it was intended to effect, namely, to equip the children of the lower classes for the occupations which they would probably have to follow.

The failings of the system are very clearly set forth in a Report which the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education have made to the Board on 'Higher Elementary Schools.' The so-called 'Higher Elementary School' is an attempt to remedy the deficiencies on which we are dwelling, and in reporting on the features which a Higher Elementary School ought in their opinion to possess the Committee have been led to some general considerations worthy of most serious attention.

The question referred to the Committee, put in its narrowest terms, was somewhat as follows. When a bright boy or girl has adequately profited by the instruction given in the elementary school up to about the age of twelve, what further teaching for two or three years will best equip him or her for one or other of the lower posts in industrial or commercial life? The Committee report somewhat as follows:

The teaching ought to be of such a character as to awaken the

interest of the pupil and to make him or her feel that what he or she is learning will be of use in the occupation which he or she will probably follow.

The teaching ought to be carried out in such a way that the senses, the hand, eye, and ear, are trained, as well as what in a narrow sense is sometimes called the 'mind,' the mind being trained as far as possible through and with the help of the body. In other words, what is sometimes called manual instruction ought to form an important part of the teaching, but ought to be made a help to and as far as possible a means of the more definitely intellectual teaching.

The teaching ought to be twofold in character: on the one hand humanistic and literary, and on the other scientific. Of the former English history and literature should supply the basis, with such extensions as may be found desirable; the latter should be furnished by elementary mathematics and some other sciences. Both kinds of teaching ought to be carried out with the view of building up character and producing a well-furnished, active, alert mind rather than with the view of imparting special knowledge; but the teacher ought to strive so to teach as to make his pupils feel that what they are being taught will be of use to them in and will fit them for their after life. In order to enable him or her to do this effectively, the teacher must have considerable latitude as to exactly what and how he or she teaches, must not be too strictly bound by formal curricula, and must be allowed, should the circumstances of the district of the school suggest it, to make use of the industries and occupations with which the pupils necessarily are familiar as the subject-matter of the teaching, but in such a way as to lead the learner to general principles and not to a premature routine acquaintance with the special practices of the industry selected for the lessons.

No one can doubt that such a kind of teaching, carried on from the age of twelve to about fifteen or even for a shorter period, by a skilful teacher, fully alive to the ideas which have led to such a programme and keen to secure the results which it promises, would in very short time raise to a marked degree the intellectual level and strengthen the characters of the pupils who had the good fortune to be so taught. But such an education is not elementary education in the sense of the Act of 1870; it is not the mere beginning of education so necessary as to justify its being paid for out of the rates; it is not an education exclusively or even specially intended or fitted for the working classes. The kind of teaching recommended for the higher elementary school by the Consultative Committee is essentially a secondary education based on the elementary education given up to about twelve years of age; and it is also emphatically and essentially such an education as with some extensions would prove the best possible education, not for the children of the working classes only, but for all those young people who have to leave school at about

fifteen or sixteen years of age in order to enter upon active life; and these form the majority of the young of the kingdom.

No wonder that a very large part, if not the greater part, of the Report of the Consultative Committee is taken up directly or indirectly by the difficulties presented by the competition naturally arising between schools offering such a teaching, under the advantages of the system of elementary education, and many of the schools teaching to a large extent at least the same subjects which are conducted under the want of system pertaining to secondary education.

These difficulties, which are too great to be satisfactorily overcome by local adjustments, and other difficulties continually met with, suggest that the present legislative distinction between elementary and secondary education needs serious reconsideration. And indeed such a reconsideration seems all the more desirable seeing that the old fundamental distinction between elementary and secondary has been done away with. Up to 1902 elementary education was that which could be paid for, secondary education that which could not be paid for, out of the rates, except in the special cases in which the Technical Instruction Act was used to promote higher technical training. The Act of 1902 introduced, in a limited way it is true, but still definitely introduced, the important principle that higher education, meaning secondary education, might be paid for out of the rates.

The removal of this clear distinction has left the differentiation between elementary and secondary education uncertain and obscure. Some have urged that elementary education is that best adapted for those who are obliged to leave school at an early age, at about 12 years or at 14 or 15 years at latest; while secondary education is that best adapted for those who can stay later up to 16 or even 18 years. But such a narrow age distinction cannot be considered satisfactory; and indeed it is in reality an indirect method of expressing what after all is the real distinction, namely, a social, a class distinction, elementary education being the education of the working classes, secondary education that of the well-to-do classes or at least of the classes of higher social rank than the working classes. This underlying distinction is perhaps better expressed by the statement that secondary education is that which leads up to university education, and elementary that which does not, but ends in itself. And this mode of expression does involve a very real distinction, through which one gets more or less to the heart of the whole matter. The universities being exacting in their demands, these have to be met, not near the close of school life only, but throughout its whole course; the whole of the teaching in the secondary school from its very beginning onwards, from its lowest classes upwards, is arranged so as to meet university requirements, irrespective of whether that teaching is or is not good for the pupils who have to leave the school at a relatively early age and do not go on to the universities. In the

elementary school, on the other hand, the teaching is at least theoretically arranged so as to help the pupil in after life at whatever age he or she leaves the school.

If this be so, and it seems to be so, there is surely something wrong here. A university career keeps the learner unproductive up to at least twenty years and in many cases much longer. But only the minority of the young of the country, the minority even of the young of the classes above the working classes, can afford to remain unproductive to so late an age. This difficulty, this very grave and serious difficulty, appears to have arisen because in education, as in other things, the evolution through which we have gone has been in some respects imperfect; in passing on to a new stage we have remained encumbered with things belonging to the old stage. In the old times the universities were the only means of education. And it must not be forgotten that they were at the beginning essentially technical institutions training men for the only careers in which learning was at that time of any use, the careers of the Church, law, and medicine. Men of noble birth did not frequent them for the sake of culture; to merchants and men of business, the book learning, which was the only learning taught by them, was useless. At that early age the universities were almost the only means of education, and such schools for the young as were established, the forerunners of our grammar schools, were mere feeders to the universities. Hence the ways of the universities governed the whole of education.

Since those early days things have changed very much; education has become the first need of all classes, and the universities now form a part only, and indeed a small part, of the whole educational mechanism. Yet, in spite of the changes which have taken place, these autonomous and to a large extent irresponsible bodies continue to dominate over a large part of education; their ways have to be followed in the greater number of the schools for the young.

This is not as it should be, not as it would have been, had the evolution of education been complete. In a complete and natural evolution, as the need for giving to all classes and all ages a training as full as possible and as closely adapted as possible to their varied circumstances became increasingly recognised, there would have gradually grown up a progressive system, under which at each successive year of school life more and more was taught to each scholar, the character of the teaching and more particularly the nature of the subjects taught being all along, but increasingly so at each successive year, made manifold in order to meet the manifold demands of actual life. This would be the natural result of the conviction that education of an appropriate kind is needed at all ages and in all stations of life. In such an evolution the university would be the means of the highest teaching in the case of each of the previous developments, its work being determined by what had gone before. Thus whatever

kind of learning was taught in the schools, with increasing fulness as the scholars advanced in age, would find its highest development in the university, and that whether the kind of learning was literary or scientific in character, including as scientific the kind which is sometimes spoken of as technical. The teaching in the schools and in the universities would both proceed along the same lines, being both directed by the desire to make the teaching fit the scholar, whether young or old, for actual life in the broadest and best way. And since the more numerous schools would be more closely in touch with actual life and more ready to recognise what kind of learning was wanted for the welfare of the nation, the ways of the schools would be the dominant ways, they would govern the ways of the universities.

Such a complete evolution, however, has not taken place, and the relations of the schools to the universities are not what has just been sketched out. The older universities, in spite of recent awakenings, are not fully in touch with actual life, and the younger universities have been in their birth, and are still in their growth, largely influenced by the traditions of their elder sisters. The difficulties which at the present day beset the schools for the middle classes, and especially those for the real middle or lower middle classes, are largely due to the demands of the universities conflicting with the demands of actual life. The university asks for one thing, while the parent who intends that his boy should go direct from the school into practical life asks for another thing; and the schoolmaster, ambitious to keep in touch with the university and yet anxious to please the parent, tries to do both things and does neither well.

It is undoubtedly a great thing that the schools should supply a ladder by which bright boys or girls may mount from the very beginnings of learning right up to the university. But they who can climb such a ladder, even though in the years to come they increase in number, and it is to be hoped that they will largely increase, must always remain the smaller number of scholars. The larger number of scholars in the schools of the country must always pass directly from the school at a variable but always early age into actual productive life. And surely to secure that these latter, these more numerous scholars should find in the school the teaching which best fits them for the struggles of actual life is a far greater thing than the provision of the 'ladder.'

Throughout our educational system at the present time may be seen a tendency to sacrifice the interests of the commonplace many, though these really need the most care, in order to secure benefits for the promising few; and this tendency is undoubtedly producing evil results, as indeed is seen in the effects of the present system of university and other scholarships. Such a tendency ought to be withstood, if nowhere else at least in our middle-class schools, seeing how important to the nation are the issues involved. One of the most

pressing needs of the present day is to ensure that the many boys and girls who leave our middle-class schools at a relatively early age should do so fitted by their school life in the best possible way to perform the duties of the posts which they are about to fill. The work of these schools ought to be most carefully directed to secure this result, instead of being governed by the desire of making the schools feeders to the universities.

If now we ask the question what ought to be the character of the work, what the kind of teaching carried on in order to secure the above result? the answer is not far to seek. The ground plan of the teaching ought to be the same as that advocated by the Consultative Committee for the Higher Elementary Schools, namely a literary training with English as its backbone, and a scientific training, both literary and scientific subjects being taught in such a way as to awaken interest and compel thought, and both combined with a correlative development of the senses and bodily faculties. On this ground-plan could be built up in the successive years of school life such successive extensions or specialisations as might seem to be called for; to English would be added foreign languages, and if need be the ancient tongues; history would develop into social economy; the artistic faculties would be cared for, and the sciences taught would be multiplied, each, as occasion demanded, being carried on into its technical applications.

Such a kind of teaching, even if imperfectly carried out, would, so far as it went, fit the scholar for practical life; not only having equipped him or her with much needed technical knowledge and skill, but also having helped to build up the character, to enlarge the mind, and to impart that general culture without something of which no one can be a proper member of society, whatever be his or her station in life. Moreover, if the teaching were well carried out, if it were placed in the hands of capable teachers with the gift of making their scholars think, the work of such a school, though primarily directed towards fitting the scholar for practical life, making him or her a useful alert citizen, would in addition, though many would not expect it, prove the best preparation for at least the newer universities with their wide entrance gates and catholic teaching, and perhaps after some years might become an acknowledged pathway to even the older ones.

Hardly anything in matters of education is more urgently wanted at the present day than the frank acknowledgment that in the schools the majority of the scholars of which pass directly from the school to active life—and such schools are not only many but increasing in number—the main business of the school ought to be the equipment of the scholars for active life, and if the school does undertake to prepare for the universities this should be regarded as a wholly subsidiary object.

The schools which we have just been discussing are 'secondary'

schools. In the eye of the law they stand in a position different from that of elementary schools; they and elementary schools are administered by different departments of the Board of Education. Yet the kind of teaching which even now does to a large extent obtain, and which ought everywhere to obtain in these schools, is, in its fundamental features, identical with the kind of teaching which the Consultative Committee advocate for Higher Elementary Schools. The basis of teaching in the two kinds of school is identical; the difference between the two lies simply in this, that in the secondary school the scholar may stay in school to a later age, and that consequently some of the teaching in the school may be more advanced and more specialised than any of the teaching in the Higher Elementary School.

Further, a large number, and indeed a rapidly increasing number of these secondary schools are governed and administered, as are the elementary schools, by the State, as represented by local authorities, municipalities and the like, and it is now legal to support or aid these schools out of the rates.

In the course of development all real distinctions between the two kinds of school have disappeared; yet they continue to bear different names and are differently administered by the central authority, with confusion and trouble as the result.

Surely there is need, and a pressing need, of some change in this respect.

One distinction of schools into kinds is fundamental, logical, and easily carried out in all its details—the distinction between the schools which are supported and governed by the State, either directly or through its representatives, the various local authorities, and the schools which are not; the distinction, in other words, between public and private schools. The two kinds of school do exist, and will continue to exist, for class distinctions and social feelings will always be strong enough to afford adequate support to private schools. At the present moment a difference in the character of the teaching carried on in the two kinds of schools is more or less obvious; the teaching in the private schools in the above sense is on the whole more elaborate and higher than that in the public schools. But there is no reason in the nature of things why this should be so; there is no reason why the teaching should not be as varied and complete in the public as in the private school. If it is to the nation's benefit to pay for the beginnings of learning; it is no less to its benefit to take care that those foundations are properly built upon, that adequate use is made of the beginnings, otherwise much of the initial expenditure would be wasted; and indeed this is now admitted. The only valid distinction between the two kinds of school lies in the one being public, the other private.

Within each kind of school, however, there can be, as regards the character of the teaching, no fundamental distinctions and certainly no binary divisions. But there can be, and indeed there must be,

within each, a multitude of smaller distinctions so as to adapt the teaching given to the varied demands of life and the varied abilities of the scholars; and it is because the artificial distinction into elementary and secondary hampers so greatly the adjustments of these smaller distinctions that it acts so injuriously.

How much we lose, and how greatly the progress of education is hindered by this present distinction, will perhaps be clearly seen if we allow ourselves to imagine what could be done if the distinction were done away with, and all public schools, all schools governed by the State, were administered under the same system. It would then be possible for a local authority, according to the demands and the opportunities of the area under its command, to establish schools of a greater or less number of different grades. In an area in which the demands and opportunities were great there might be several grades, distinguished from each other by the progressively advanced character of the teaching. In the lowest grade the teaching would be simple and elementary in the true sense of the term; in succeeding grades the teaching would become more varied and more advanced; and in the highest grade—in the case of some areas at least, if not in all—the teaching would be of such a kind that the scholar might pass from it to a university, the teaching in which was adequately catholic, and included so-called technical as well as humanistic and culture studies. All the grades being under one administration, many of the present difficulties attendant on the transference of a scholar from one grade to another would disappear; the main condition of transference would be, not so much the mere age, as the progress, ability, and promise of the scholar. The schools of all grades would be of a general character; but in some areas it might be found of advantage to make in this or that grade this or that kind of teaching more or less dominant; and again in some areas schools of a distinctly special character might be established. Indeed, not the least merit of such a system would be that it permitted, what is so difficult under the present arrangement, as much elasticity and variety of teaching in each area as the circumstances of the area demanded and allowed.

Such a system would bring us far nearer than can ever be possible under present arrangements to that ideal condition of things in which each scholar would be put within reach of the particular kind and amount of teaching suited to develop most fully his or her latent abilities. But the benefits to the teacher would be at least no less than those to the scholar. No one who ponders over the present condition of education can look without misgivings and forebodings on the position and prospects of what are now known as elementary teachers. The result of our educational legislation has been to create, under this term, a special caste of teachers, sharply isolated from all other teachers. Important as from every point of view their duties are, these have a very limited range and are so uniform in all

the schools, and so simple as to encourage, and indeed to render up to a certain extent successful, a rigid mechanical handling of them on the part both of the authorities and of the teachers themselves. Deeply as the individual teacher may feel the great responsibilities put upon him (and 'him' must be understood here to include 'her') in laying the foundations of knowledge, ability, and character in the small section of the great industrial class entrusted to his care, and great as may be his aspirations to contribute to the nation's welfare by yearly leading a group of children on the way to become intelligent, alert, and wholesome citizens, he is conscious that he cannot always do what he thinks best, but must work within the narrow limits of the rules prescribed for him; and should he unhappily have no such feelings or aspirations, his teaching becomes of the worst mechanical kind; the weight of routine and monotonous uniformity presses heavily on every elementary teacher, good or bad. And the training which he has had to qualify him for the post is a training by itself, a training carried out in most cases apart from other teachers, a training narrowly directed to fit him for his particular duties only, and, like those duties, stamped with the stamp of mechanical uniformity. Both the duties and the training tend to make him a something different from all others engaged in the great work of teaching and to write on his forehead the signs of a special caste.

Moreover, the body which he has joined, the system of which he has become a part, is a closed system, within which there is little to excite his ambition; the most he can look for being a larger and a better school. Monotony and uniformity darken his whole career, as they do his training and his duties. The system itself leads to nowhere; the teacher's chief hope to better himself lies in leaving it.

All this is bad, bad in many ways. It tends to make the teacher of the industrial young a stereotyped mechanical mediocrity; whereas it may with great force be urged that he perhaps even more than other teachers ought to be elastic and versatile, since laying rightly the foundations of knowledge and character is a harder task, and especially a task demanding greater variety of aptitude and greater power than that of merely carrying onward a little farther those who have already advanced some distance on the way. It further has an injurious effect in preventing the education of the industrial young from keeping in touch with other education and in hindering the flow of salutary influences backward, from the higher to the lower kinds of teaching.

Were the present artificial distinction done away with, were all the State-aided schools recognised as forming one system within which were many different grades and kinds of teaching, most of these evils would disappear. The bright young teacher beginning his career in the humblest of primary schools would be spurred by the hope of reaching in his maturer years a post of no small importance and emolument; and even if he were led to remain to the end in the more

lowly post he would be sustained by the feeling that he was a fellow member of the same body as some of the most prominent schoolmasters of the day. In a system based on the transference of scholars, according to their fitness, from a lower to a higher school, all grades would influence each other; the higher grade would be led to take care that its teaching was such as to be of the most profit to the scholars coming to it from the lower grade, and the lower grade would be stimulated to make its teaching such that its scholars would be ready to benefit by the teaching supplied by the higher grade. And possibly, from time to time, an authority impressed with the importance of laying a sound foundation might take such steps as would secure for the post of master in a primary school a teacher whose experience in the higher schools had taught him what such a foundation ought to be.

Is it not possible to bring about some of the changes dwelt upon above?

The organisation of all public schools, that is to say of all schools supported by the State, into a homogeneous system of graded schools would of course involve taking steps to arrange the relations of such schools and of all belonging to them to schools not so supported by the State. Such steps would entail many and great difficulties, bringing in considerations different from any of the foregoing, but difficulties which do not seem unsurmountable.

M. FOSTER.

January 27th, 1907.

THE IRISH POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

AFTER an interval of thirteen years the Liberal party is about to enter upon its third campaign in the cause of self-government for Ireland.

Liberals, who for a period of twenty-one years—broken by a brief and stormy interval—were excluded from power as the penalty of their Home Rule Policy, contemplate with profound anxiety the doubtful issues of the conflict that confronts them. In 1885 the Liberal party obtained a majority which, though numerically less than that of 1906, yet in devotion to a great leader, in enthusiasm for those projects of social reform in the pursuit of which it had secured the confidence of the electorate, and in unity of purpose and action, was unsurpassed in the history of political parties. But its swift downfall was as complete as its victory. From that downfall slowly and laboriously it has carried out the work of reparation; the confidence of the electorate has been regained, social forces almost wholly estranged have been in part conciliated, and a policy of domestic reform larger and more generous than that of 1885 has, with the general assent of the party, been enunciated and partially realised.

And now the forces that triumphed in 1886 are again arrayed against it; the once familiar catchwords of the Unionist party are again heard, and the House of Lords is pointed to as the inexorable arbiter which will condemn its policy and compel this great Liberal party prematurely to dissolve and commit its fortunes to the doubtful judgment of a fickle electorate.

And yet, despite these sinister forebodings on the part of those who compare the superficial resemblance of the present situation with that of 1886, there are some not insignificant reasons for thinking that it may well be within the power of Parliament to improve the conditions of Irish government without violating the strictest canons of Unionism, and yet afford to the Irish people effective redress of some very real grievances, which redress, though it will not stay the demand for Home Rule, may tend to lessen its exigency, or, at any rate, will not grant to it additional force or facility.

The economic and social condition of Ireland is now infinitely more favourable to the concession of powers of self-government than it was in 1886 or 1893. 'Ireland,' to quote a recent speech of

Mr. Redmond in the House of Commons, 'is peaceful; there is no political disorder or crime of any sort in the country.' The legislation of the past few years has wrought a wondrous change; the Land Act of 1903 and other remedial legislation have removed discontent, at least so far as it was associated with the relations of landlord and tenant; in 1881–82, 21,000 families were evicted, now evictions are practically obsolete—in a word, so far as legislation is concerned, save for the non-application of the principle of compulsion, all that legislation can effect for vesting on the most liberal conditions the land in the hands of the peasantry, and for their protection from exaction and oppression on the part of landlords, has been effected.

The significant fact must not, however, be overlooked that this economic pacification of Ireland has deprived the Home Rule movement of its most potent ally—*i.e.* agrarian discontent. It is not to be suggested that the desire of the Irish people for self-government is abated; through the many centuries of British rule the Irish people have never wavered in their devotion to the principle of 'Ireland for the Irish.' Yet never was the Nationalist movement so vigorous and so dangerous to the supremacy of Great Britain as it was from the formation of the Land League in 1869, until the remedial legislation of the past few years began to bear fruit. When the Land League was at the zenith of its power, the government of Ireland had passed from the hands of the Queen's Ministers into those of the Nationalist leaders; in 1886, as was stated on high authority, 'throughout the greater portion of the island the Queen's writ did not run.'

It has become almost an accepted axiom in English politics that violence, or the fear of violence, is the most effective instrument for securing to the aggrieved legislative redress, and there are numerous instances to support the truth of this deplorable proposition. Certainly, Mr. Gladstone's heroic legislation of 1886 was largely inspired by the conviction that only thereby could be effected 'a reconciliation between the people and the law'; and abundant evidence could be adduced to demonstrate that of those who supported Home Rule in 1886 no small proportion were influenced more by impatience with the incapacity of 'Castle Rule' to maintain law and order than by a generous desire to satisfy the just requirements of the Irish people.

No longer under such conditions, but under those, as above described by Mr. Redmond, of perfect peace and security, is the claim for self-government now again advanced. England remained unmoved and unsympathetic when in 1886 Ireland was on the verge of revolution, when the forces of law and order were in abeyance, and when she won as an advocate to plead her cause the greatest statesman of the age.

It cannot be doubted that the Irish leaders are fully sensible that amid the imperative claims of domestic legislation the English electorate is not likely to welcome the recrudescence of the Home Rule controversy. Their attitude towards Home Rule is well reflected

in that of their Parliamentary representatives: a considerable proportion of Liberal members are declared opponents, a larger number have adopted the more diplomatic course—and herein they have behind them the authority of Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey—of asserting that they will lend no countenance to any legislative action for Home Rule during the present Parliament. The Nationalist party have gracefully acquiesced in the inevitable; they in effect make this declaration: 'We demand a Parliament and an Executive responsible to it. We should prefer the full measure at once; but if the time be not opportune to concede it, then'—and these are the words of Mr. Redmond in the speech above quoted—'we will give every encouragement to the Government in their efforts to deal with this question. In dealing with it they will find in us reasonable and practical men.' These words clearly mean that the Irish will not repudiate nor denounce a measure containing within it the principle of self-government, but not involving the establishment of a 'Parliament' and 'an Executive responsible to it.'

Mr. Birrell sardonically observed, during the debate on the Address, in reply to a somewhat skirmishing attack by Mr. Long, that the Opposition will doubtless declare, whatever the character may be of his Bill for the future government of Ireland, that 'it will inevitably lead up to Home Rule,' and, therefore, it will meet with their uncompromising hostility. There is reason to doubt whether this allegation be well founded.

No one, indeed, can doubt that the projected scheme of self-government for Ireland must be a step in the direction of Home Rule. The Prime Minister has himself so declared when he said that the 'instalment of representative control' which he intended to offer would 'lead up to their larger policy.' It is true that there might be a reorganisation of local government, which would not involve, and might, indeed, be repugnant to, an advance towards the larger policy—*e.g.* the functions of the very numerous boards which control matters of local government might be concentrated in a single nominative body. This obviously would not carry the principle of Home Rule any further; on the contrary, in so far as it might mitigate the inconveniences resulting from the present multiplication of authorities, it might tend to weaken the movement for an independent Parliament.

Unfortunately a golden opportunity for conceding to Ireland not Home Rule, nor, perhaps, even the germ of Home Rule, but a better system of government, was lost through the indiscretion of those, who conceived the plan, in appointing Sir Antony MacDonnell to the office of Under-Secretary. A Catholic, a reputed Home Ruler—though the fact was apparently otherwise—an intimate of the Nationalist leaders, these were attributes ill-calculated to conciliate the suspicious and susceptible North of Ireland Protestants; and when it became known that this gentleman was accepted by Mr. Wyndham as a

'colleague' rather than a servant, religious and political prejudices were aflame, and the generous and courageous aspirations of Mr. Wyndham for the co-ordination and rearrangement of the system of Irish government were defeated.

Parenthetically, it may be observed that a very grave departure from constitutional principle and practice was made both in the terms of Sir A. MacDonnell's appointment and in the license which was accorded to him to express *coram populo* his personal opinions on matters of public policy. It has ever been the genius of the English constitution to seclude the permanent official from public observation, and, on the other hand, to place the Minister of the Crown in its fullest glare. It is a matter of the highest public policy that the personality of the permanent official should not be interposed between Parliament and the responsibility of the Minister, and it needs no demonstration to establish that the usurpation by permanent officials of authority to express publicly their opinions on matters of State policy, whether in support of or antagonistic to the projects of Government, is calculated to hurt the authority of Ministers and impair the control of Parliament. It is noteworthy that Continental constitutional writers, in contrasting the status of permanent officials in France, and the incidence of the *Droit administratif* with the practice and custom of this country, have pointed to the latter as affording the surest guarantees for the maintenance of public liberty.

Let us momentarily review the situation in Ireland of to-day, and state it as follows: (1) The purchase and transfer of land from landlords to their tenantry under the Act of 1903 is in course of completion; to facilitate its process compulsion may be necessary; but the following brief statement bears eloquent testimony to the substantial progress that has been made in the creation of an Irish peasant proprietary. Land legislation for the benefit of the tenantry commenced with the Irish Church Act of 1869, and culminated in the Land Act of 1903. Under these Acts, out of a grand total of 490,301 agricultural holdings in Ireland down to the 9th of February, 1907, 115,698 have been sold to tenant purchasers, and to this total may be added 103,380 holdings agreed to be sold, but in respect of which applications for advances are pending, leaving 271,223 holdings in respect of which no applications have yet been received. It is interesting to note that the advances made by the State up to the 30th of June, 1906, amounted to 38,404,925*l.*; but to this there must be a considerable increase, as from June up to the 9th of February, 1907, 5,407 additional holdings have been sold; (2) the machinery for the regulation of rents, though working slowly under unsympathetic superintendence, is perfected, and evictions have ceased; (3) the restitution of evicted tenants is being proceeded with, and will shortly be finally effected.

These things have been done through the action of a Conservative

Government by a Conservative Parliament. What remains? What are the grievances of 1907? In round figures the revenue raised from Ireland is 10,000,000*l*., of which about 7,500,000*l*. is consumed in Ireland, the residue constituting her imperial contribution. Apart from the highly controversial question whether Ireland is taxed beyond her taxable capacity, with which, of course, no Irish legislature could finally deal, there is doubtless great waste of public moneys, and, therefore, the plan of co-ordination and consolidation would be a valuable instrument for effecting further economies. There is need, and in some instances pressing need, for what in England would be done by the localities concerned, but in Ireland must in the main be left to the care of the State—namely, the development of localities by public improvement; and, finally, there is wasteful and unsympathetic administration by the multitudinous boards and departments to which the duty of local government is confided.

When, therefore, we consider the efforts that Parliament has made to remedy the economic grievances of the Irish people, the reflection must necessarily arise whether it would be possible for a Home Rule Parliament to deal more benevolently and philanthropically than England has dealt since her work of conciliation commenced. In the terrible image founded on a weird Persian fable of 'a monster cursed with two principles of volition, self-loathing and self-torturing, made up of parts which are driven by a frantic impulse to inflict mutual pain, yet are doomed to feel whatever they inflict; which are divided by an irreconcilable hatred, yet are blended in an indissoluble identity,' Macaulay luridly but faithfully depicted the wretched consequences of the union between Great Britain and Ireland. But all this is of the past; the savage, ruthless rule which lasted for centuries has terminated, and now for many years the English Parliament, responsive to the influence of the elected representatives of the Irish people, has laboured and not in vain to promote the material welfare of their country.

It is now beyond serious controversy that some amendment of Irish government in the direction of devolution is necessary in order to secure efficiency and economy of administration. The recent action of Lord Dunraven and many other Irishmen of rank and influence, in endeavouring to promote a scheme of devolution, indicates that the Nationalist movement in a modified form is no longer confined to the humble classes of Irish society. Nay more, although the precise attitude of the late Ministry towards the devolution proposals of Lord Dunraven and Sir Antony MacDonnell is still involved in obscurity, we are entitled to infer that whether the statutory body they contemplated was to be wholly elective, or nominative and elective, and whether it was to enjoy minor legislative or merely administrative powers, it was undoubtedly their intention that it should exercise either the same or larger powers than those at present exercised by the numerous boards, be they sixty-seven as stated by Mr. Redmond or

less, which, with administrative chaos, financial waste, and often anti-popular tendencies, discharge the functions of government.

There is but slight evidence to indicate that the late Government contemplated any change in the government of Ireland which could justly expose them to the charge of having abandoned Unionist principles. Some colour is undoubtedly given to the charge by reason of the share which Sir A. MacDonnell, while in office as Under-Secretary for Ireland, took in preparing the report of Lord Dunraven's association in favour of devolution. That report contemplated the constitution of a statutory body consisting of Irish peers and members of the House of Commons representing Irish constituencies—in fact, a mimic Parliament to which the Imperial Parliament might, in its discretion, refer 'private bill legislation and such other matters as in its wisdom it may deem suitable for reference under prescribed conditions.' It is obvious that a body so constituted would, before very long, extend its powers to the standard of Nationalist aspiration.

But if the plan contemplated by the late Government did not extend beyond the co-ordination and consolidation of the various administrative boards and departments, and constituted nothing more than the concession of powers similar to those enjoyed by the Indian Council, it is certain that it would not satisfy, even temporarily, the Irish demand; it would, indeed, be wholly incompatible with the genius of a free people, though for purely administrative purposes it would lead to economy and efficiency.

If we take a broad view of the situation, we are bound to admit that circumstances are now infinitely more favourable for a moderate and judicious extension of self-government than they were in 1886 and 1893. As already observed, the cry of spoliation is for ever silenced through the agency of the Land Act of 1903. The weakness, disorganisation, and distraction of the Conservative party must inevitably render it a less formidable fighting force both in Parliament and the country than the Unionist party of the former epochs; and thus, though the action of the House of Lords might compel the Liberal administration to appeal to the electorate, their prospects of success at the polls would be brighter. Further, the Conservative party, in offering opposition to the proposals of the present Government, would be bound to contradistinguish between the policy of Mr. Wyndham and that of Mr. Birrell, and unless that contradistinction unequivocally vindicated their scheme or conception from all taint of the principle of Home Rule, their criticism must be ineffective and their hostility insincere.

No good purpose can be served by elaborate speculation upon the precise form of Mr. Birrell's proposals; but the general bearings of the projected legislation may reasonably be canvassed and considered. At the outset it cannot too strongly be insisted upon that the measure

must not be the δοθὶ ποῦ στῶ for Home Rule; it must not be the vantage-ground from which pressure may forthwith be effectively exerted in order to overthrow the Parliamentary union of the two countries. Home Rule must neither be the immediate consequence nor the ostensible purpose of the measure. Those who, like the writer of this article, are still loyal to the policy which they supported in 1886, recognise that only under these conditions can the Government Bill have any reasonable prospect of success.

It is desirable that the statutory body should be elected *ad hoc*. A delegation from both Houses of Parliament, as suggested in the Dunraven scheme, is open to many objections, not the least that a combination of Protestant Conservative Peers and Catholic Nationalist members of Parliament does not afford the happiest augury of peace and concord in the contemplated council.

It seems not unreasonable to suggest that a small compact body would more efficiently, and with less friction, discharge its functions than one of large dimensions, and that moderation and stability would be better secured by some restriction—at any rate temporary—of the franchise upon which the statutory body was elected, rather than by resorting to the anti-democratic methods of nomination by the Crown or co-optation from other bodies; and, finally, that the electoral unit for Parliamentary elections should not be adopted, and this for two main reasons—firstly, the unnecessary size of the body that would result therefrom, and, secondly, the desirability of securing a larger unit, whereby, to a great extent, those disturbing influences which too frequently dominate elections in small areas may be avoided and for this purpose the division of Ireland into provinces might suggest the expediency of establishing the province as the unit for election.

As regards the powers to be conferred on the proposed body, we may reasonably anticipate equal moderation on the part of Mr. Redmond and his followers to that which they appear disposed to extend in relation to the constitution. Legislative functions, save in respect of private Bills, it may be inferred, it will not enjoy; its most important duty will be the administration of finance, and it is reasonably anticipated that by economic administration and the reduction of specific items of expenditure it will effect a large saving which may be devoted to reproductive works, such as arterial drainage, improvement of transit, the development of the Labourers Acts, and cognate objects. The chief directions in which economy may be effected would be the judicature and police departments, in which the grossest extravagance prevails; but it is inevitable that the transference to the statutory body of control of the Irish Constabulary, which discharges the duties of a garrison as well as those of a police force, would be regarded with great jealousy and distrust by the Unionist party. Nevertheless, a proper check through the medium of the Imperial

executive might be provided to prevent any possible abuse by the statutory body of these powers. There remains the question of education. It is incontestable that the condition of elementary education in Ireland is deplorable: school buildings are defective, the teachers are ill paid, and consequently too often incompetent, and the equipment of the majority of schools wholly insufficient. Why does this lamentable state of things obtain in Ireland? The simple answer is that Irish education is purely denominational, and a Chief Secretary would hesitate long before he ventured to brave the storm that would undoubtedly rise in this country if he attempted, on those denominational lines which would alone be acceptable in Ireland, reorganisation and adequate endowment of her elementary schools. It is beyond question that educational progress in Ireland is at a standstill, and will so remain until it is placed under the control of a representative Irish authority. Objections are urged against the suggestion to confer on the statutory body the control of expenditure. The contention is, and it was urged with great force and ingenuity by Lord Atkinson when the Dunraven proposals were under discussion, that this power would violate a cardinal constitutional principle—namely, that the appropriation of expenditure must be made by Parliament which votes the finance. This principle is, indeed, unimpeachable where the grant is made to the Crown; but where the authority to whom the power of applying funds may be conceded is popularly elected *ad hoc*, the objection savours of constitutional pedantry. Provided the general directions of expenditure be carefully defined, there appears no reason why a certain latitude in appropriation might not be permitted to the statutory body.

May we not, standing for one moment outside the narrow confines of party, view, as it were from some specular height. the positions occupied by those who are striving with no ignoble motives to maintain the great ideal of Imperial unity, and of those who, on the other hand, are making yet another effort to destroy that spurious unity which is the product of coercion, and build up in its place the nobler and more lasting unity that springs from mutual regard and common interest? It is idle to deny that both contending parties have the same end in view—the well-being of Ireland and the security of the Empire; but there is something more needed than the material well-being of Ireland, and that is national contentment; and at this crisis, when economic evils are abated, when law and order are maintained, not by the forces of the Crown, but by the goodwill of her people, might we not indulge in the hope that these opposing forces may cease contention and co-operate for the purpose of finding a durable and reasonable solution of this pernicious controversy?

L. A. Atherley-Jones.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: A PLEA FOR REFORM

To those who have devoted any attention of late years to the manner in which religion and politics have become so unhappily blended, the future of our present Established Church must have appeared to be one of the gravest peril. It cannot possibly be denied that each one of the last few General Elections has seen the opponents of the Established Church grow more numerous and more outspoken in their envious hatred of a rival who, to within the last few months, had not deigned even to defend herself from these rapacious attacks. Why the Established Church should have raised up so many and such bitter enemies, and why their numbers and their hostility should have so steadily increased, may, at first sight, appear extraordinary to those who remember the praiseworthy efforts which, to their great credit, the vast majority of the parish clergy have made to hold themselves aloof from political questions of the day and to work on amicable terms with the disciples of other forms of Christian religion. It is certainly almost beyond doubt that the very few instances of indiscretion which have been committed by clerics of the Church, and which have been exploited to their utmost value by political and religious opponents, would not, in themselves, have been sufficient to arouse the deep-seated and general resentment which undoubtedly exists and which it would be worse than foolish to ignore. To what, therefore, is it possible to attribute the present almost friendless position of the Church? The answer, if one is to be found, must be in the constitution of the Church herself. It has been said, and, unfortunately, with too great truth, that we are no longer a nation of shopkeepers, but a nation of politicians. Nowadays, no man is content to be governed, he is not to be satisfied until he is given some kind of say in the matter himself. That he was being well governed before is nothing to the point, in his opinion. If the individual himself were asked to explain his reasons, his answer would probably be to the effect that he would prefer to be ill-governed and cheated by a representative Government in whose appointment he himself had acted a small part, than to enjoy all the blessings of the finest administration that could possibly be conceived, if that adminis-

tration were to be directed by a dictator. Recent legislation—and legislation nowadays has deteriorated into what is very little better than vote-catching—has furnished continual examples of the acuteness shown by the politicians of both parties in pandering to this innate spirit of meddlesomeness in the electorate. Our present County, District, Parish, and Municipal Councils are all instances in point, though it is extremely doubtful if the individual is in the slightest degree better off than he was in the days when nine-tenths of the work was done by the county justices at an infinitely less cost.

If we accept this reason of the constitution of the Church as the reason for the hostility shown to it, it also enables us to understand the deplorable apathy shown by the vast majority of Churchmen to the perilous position in which the Church finds herself. This indifference, in a cause which should evoke the utmost interest and activity of those who really value the form of religion they have chosen for their own, arises from causes very similar to those which have banded together the followers of other religions in their assaults on the Church. Even those who approve of an autocratic form of government, either in religion or politics, seldom manage to muster much enthusiasm in its support. Autocracy, while frequently working well and nearly always with a total absence of the unpleasant wrangles and dissensions which periodically occur in representative assemblies, yet, by its independence of the support of the individual, automatically loses that whole-hearted allegiance of its subjects which, in the hour of danger, is as necessary to a Church as to a dynasty. It is from this indifference on the part of its members, almost equally as much as from the attacks of its enemies, that the Church of England is now suffering. Strenuous efforts have been, and are being, made by an alarmed clergy and by a few of the more deeply-thinking and self-sacrificing lay members of the Church to instil a more energetic spirit of combination and resistance into the rank and file of their supporters. These efforts, however, are producing but a feeble response, and it is but too evident that, unless drastic and far-reaching alterations in its constitution are voluntarily made by those who hold the reins of power to-day, the hour of the Established Church is at hand. Even in these partial and spasmodic efforts to avert the impending doom, the inherent weakness of the Church may clearly be seen. The archbishops have little control over their subordinates, the bishops differ widely in their rule and in their teaching, the High Church and Low Church parish clergy are fighting amongst themselves. While all are agreed that organised opposition to the attacks that are being made upon them is urgently necessary, there is no agreement as to the proper methods to be adopted to meet them. While, in one diocese, a bishop sets the example of voluntary surrender of power in order to encourage the interest of his supporters and to conciliate the more moderately minded of his opponents, in

another the bishop insists on the carrying out in every parish church of those parts of the ritual of the Church which many of its best supporters would be glad to see omitted, both on the score of policy and of a more modern and tolerant conception of the teachings of Christianity. Such a want of unity between high ecclesiastical authorities is bound to react unfavourably upon the designs of all and to paralyse initiative among the lower officials and the lay workers. No band of workers, however zealous and devoted, can possibly hope to obtain any proportionate result from their efforts, unless these efforts are clearly directed towards the same objective and receive the same encouragement from all interested in the movement.

That the Church is profoundly indebted to those who, like the Bishop of Rochester, recognise that a partial renunciation of rights and prerogatives is the only alternative to complete annihilation, and have the courage to set a much-needed example, is beyond controversy. What may be doubted, however, is whether the power of the bishops, great though it be, and tolerant though most of them are, is yet sufficient to enable them to fully meet the demands which the situation undoubtedly requires. We are informed, through the public press, that the Bishop of Rochester has handed over the right of presentation to a living, in all those cases where the gift is in his hands, to the members of the Church of England resident in the respective parishes. This is really all that he has it in his power to do, and it is to be presumed that it would be within the power of his successor to revoke even that. What is wanted is that the power of appointment should be permanently vested in the members of every parish congregation. Moreover, in these democratic days, it is impossible to argue that a cure of souls should, when once given to a clergyman, remain his for the term of his natural life, irrespective of the condition to which age and its attendant infirmities may have reduced him. With the acceptance of the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire has come the conviction that only those capable in mind and body of executing the provisions of the trust should be allowed to draw the emoluments pertaining to it. Now the constitution of the Church of England utterly fails to carry out either of these primary duties. The gross mismanagement of the vast funds at the disposal of the Church enables some of its dignitaries to enjoy a life of luxurious leisure, while many of its most hardly worked members are barely provided with the ordinary necessaries of existence. The methods of examination as to the fitness of candidates for Holy Orders are so deficient as to admit into the Church men whose want of theological knowledge is so intense as to arouse the contempt and indignation of many of the lay members of their flocks. A recent letter to a newspaper, written by a clergyman of the Church of England, admitted this unfortunate fact fully, and complained bitterly that the religious education of the majority

of our clerics was far inferior to that possessed by the ministers of the Nonconformist Churches. The system of appointment to livings is hopelessly archaic. While there is something to be said in favour of appointment by a bishop on the score of his technical knowledge of what is required from an incumbent, there can be no defence of the power of appointment possessed by rich men and richer colleges merely by reason of the fact that they have chosen to invest their capital in land. The bestowal of a living by a college is nearly always made the occasion for a pure job, the fitness of a man for a town or country living hardly enters into the calculation of the college authorities; what is far more to the point in their opinion is which of the two the candidate prefers. Their knowledge of the districts to whose spiritual needs they are supposed to administer is, with the exception of that of the college bursar, absolutely nil, and, even in his case, it is dependent entirely on a bi-yearly excursion to collect rents. The case of appointment by a local magnate is almost equally indefensible. It is certainly true that the landlord has usually a good general knowledge of the requirements of the district, although even this is by no means always the case, but against this has to be set the great probability that the donor has only the haziest conceptions of what the duties of a cleric should be. The average country gentleman is usually perfectly pleased with himself and confident that he has done his duty by his neighbours if he appoints a man on whom he can rely not to preach a sermon of more than ten minutes' duration, who can play with a straight bat, bowl a decent length ball, and perhaps make a fourth at bridge. Now, it is not to be denied that a clergyman who can take an able part in the innocent amusements of his parishioners has an added opportunity of doing good amongst them, but these accomplishments should be considered as an additional and not as an essential reason for the appointment.

While this question of appointment however remains a grave blot upon the management of the Church, there are other and even more serious ones connected with it. To appoint a clergyman to a living is a very easy thing to do; to deprive him of it is almost a sheer impossibility, short of assistance in the shape of gross misconduct on the part of the beneficiary himself. That an incumbent should be carefully guarded against the hasty or intolerant actions of a person or a board is only just, but that, short of the gravest misbehaviour, a man should be at liberty to flout the wishes of his entire congregation, to neglect its needs, to deface its church, to desecrate its graveyard, to do all or any of these things and to be enabled, while so doing, to draw the emoluments of his office during such period as he chooses to hold the living even up to the day of his death, is just neither to the cleric nor his parishioners. The official has no encouragement to exert himself or to assist his flock, while they, in their turn, regard the behaviour of their shepherd with ovine

listlessness, knowing well that, whatever they may think or say, it is of absolutely no importance at all. That, under such unfavourable conditions, the work of the clergy of the Established Church has reached such a high general level of excellence redounds enormously to their credit, but is no answer in favour of the existing pernicious system.

Like most other mediæval constitutions, however, the Church of England is consistent only in its inconsistencies. Although for its own purposes it raises up and maintains its officials on a pinnacle of power beyond the possibility of influence by their subjects, yet its cruelty and callousness to the sufferings of its disciples when failing health has robbed them of their usefulness to it in its work, is monumental and almost incredible—such, in fact, as would not be sanctioned for one moment in any other institution existing by the will of Parliament. No matter how long a cleric may have laboured, no matter how valuable his services may have been, no matter how much he may have spent out of his stipend in the cause of charity or religion, all these considerations weigh as nothing when the time comes at which he feels himself unable to continue to hold his post without injury to his health and to the cause for which he has worked. It is true that charitable persons have contributed to a fund with the object of ameliorating the condition of the most unfortunate of the disabled soldiers of a Church which turns its back upon those who have fallen in its service, more pitiless in its forgetfulness than ever Le Roi Soleil was to a beaten marshal; but the fund is small out of all proportion compared to the heavy calls made upon it, and the Church itself contributes nothing. As might be expected as a natural outcome of such a selfish policy, the effects recoil with most damaging results upon the perpetrator of these follies. The average clergyman, not being sufficiently endowed with the goods of this world to enable him to contemplate with equanimity such a decrease in his income as the surrender of his living would involve, is forced to put the question of the welfare of his flock entirely on one side, and to hold desperately on to his post regardless of his continually increasing inability to perform his proper duties. The result which naturally follows in such a case is that the spiritual care of the parish is neglected, the numbers of the congregation fall off, and the ministers of Dissent, ever on the look-out to improve their position, find a ready and fruitful field awaiting their labours.

Nothing short of radical reformation of methods to meet all the above existing abuses is in the least likely to assist the Church of England in the approaching conflict. It is imperative that, in order to secure the active support of the laity, the churches, the churchyards, and all church buildings, should be under the management of the congregation. It is grossly unfair to an incumbent that he should be expected to keep all church property in his parish in good repair at his own expense, or to be obliged to go round with the hat

begging subscriptions from people to repair buildings in which they are not allowed to have any vested interest. The methods of appointment to a living should be entirely altered. Presentation to a living by an individual, a college, or even a bishop should be rendered impossible. Only those who are in every way qualified for a cure of souls should be allowed to apply for a living, and the gift itself should be entirely in the hands of the congregation. The power of dismissal must belong to those most nearly affected by incompetence or undesirability, and a mandate from two-thirds of the parishioners should be decisive. The revenues of the Church should be controlled by a financial body composed of two-thirds laity and one-third clergy, and adequate pensions given to those who, having served their Church well, are incapacitated from further ministration of their duties. It should be a recognised principle that the stipend of a cleric should be the return for the work he has accomplished, and that, under no circumstances, should he be expected, as at present, to play the part of a glorified relieving-officer. There can be no reasonable doubt that the funds of the Church, being at present in the hands of those who have no expert knowledge of finance, are most shockingly mismanaged and wasted. The travesty of a balance-sheet issued as an *apologia* by one of the most brilliant and hard-working of modern clerics the Bishop of London, is well worthy of study as proving the total incapacity of even the cleverest of his cloth to do the work required of him, and, at the same time, to distribute the wealth which, if he has fairly earned it, should be his to do what he likes with, and which an absurd system expects him to dispense in charity. This extraordinary and amusing document clearly proved how money is at present wasted. Large sums were apparently squandered on what are familiarly known as 'bun-worries,' as an extension, presumably, of the methods by which little children are enticed into attending Sunday school by the promise of 'treats.' The casual manner, also, in which applications for financial assistance were considered and dealt with was flagrantly exposed a little later in the confessions of a prisoner who admitted having received considerable sums from the Bishop, although the briefest inquiry at the offices of the society which exists for that purpose would have at once elicited the fact that the applicant was entirely unworthy of the help she received.

The real reason, however, why this balance-sheet is deserving of attention is because it is representative of what goes on all over the country, and because of the reasons which prompted the Bishop to publish it. It is fair to assume that, if a man like the Bishop of London, who has worked his way up to the high position he now holds by sheer hard work and ability, is in the habit of wasting money, less gifted clergymen will, in proportion, waste much more, and therefore it is in the highest degree necessary that the power of the

clergy to make away with funds of which they are, after all, only the trustees, should be greatly curtailed. Nor should the reason for the publication by the Bishop of this balance-sheet be ignored, inasmuch as it has its origin in one of the most iniquitous of the slanders which the enemies of the Church are constantly spreading among the more ignorant section of the public concerning the enormous salaries on which, they insinuate, the bishops batten. It is not difficult to excite feelings of envy and hatred among those struggling to obtain an honest livelihood, by the simple expedient of pointing out the palaces in which some of the chief clerics of the Church reside, informing these hopeless toilers of the 10,000*l.* or 15,000*l.* that the country provides in order to enable these dignitaries to dwell in ease and luxury, and carefully suppressing all reference to the hosts of dependents and charities which it is the duty of the recipient of this princely salary to support. There is only one way in which the poisoned tongue of these traducers can be effectively silenced, and that is to relieve the clergy of the duty of administering, out of their incomes, to the multifarious calls of Church and charity, and to appoint a secular body who will do the work for them.

We have, in the Disestablished Church of Ireland, an excellent model of a system which, enlarged and slightly modified, would admirably suit the conditions of a Reformed Established Church of England. In the Church of Ireland the great principle of self-help is given full scope to prove its capacity to excite the best efforts of all fervent religionists. In that Church every parish is encouraged, by judicious assistance from the governing body, to do all that lies in its power in order to make both the church and the living worthy of its incumbent. A congregation which neglects the warning that a servant is worthy of his hire is sharply reminded of it in a very practical manner. As the result of a knowledge that promotion depends on the ability to render a satisfactory account of his previous stewardship, a cleric is directly encouraged to give his best efforts to the work before him; while, should his health fail him and compel him to relinquish his labours, he knows that the practical management of the funds of the Church is such as to secure to him a moderate pension based on the amount of the salary attached to the position he had last held. That these new methods have been crowned with success there is no room to doubt. It is impossible for even the most casual visitor to Ireland not to recognise the enormous difference that exists between the tolerant apathy felt by the average Englishman towards the position of his Church, and the keen appreciation which all members of the Irish Church take in whatever concerns their religious interests. It may be urged that this laudable spirit is the direct result of Disestablishment, and that nothing short of a similar measure is likely to do the Church of England any good, but it is difficult to collect much good evidence to support such a view.

It very probably was the case that the clergy of the Irish Church were, previous to Disestablishment, just as indifferent to public opinion as their colleagues in England are to-day, and just as averse to surrendering the slightest shreds of power; also it is undoubtedly true that some of the firmest supporters of the doctrines of the Irish Church voted in favour of Disestablishment when that measure was brought forward, but, if the present position of the Irish Church be examined, it will be found that the real reason for the strength of its institutions rests on the loyal co-operation of its workers which an improved organisation has rallied to its standard, and not to a severance of Church and State with its attendant loss of revenue. The internal government of the Church of Ireland is, in fact, well worth the attention of those who wish to save the Church of England from itself.

The present opportunity of the clergy, to gracefully waive their claim to an independence of which they will most certainly be otherwise very quickly deprived, is one which will never recur. It has arisen purely owing to a total misconception by the party authorities of the strength of the Nonconformists over all other parties in the House of Commons. Consequent on that error in calculation the Government has hesitated to declare open war on the Church of England, and has endeavoured to make sure of the allegiance of as many of its supporters as possible by directing its assault on the Church of England schools, a subject on which, as they knew, many earnest members of that Church were in entire agreement with them. But for that error in tactics the Established Church might easily, before now, have ceased to exist. The success of a bold attack can hardly be doubted when one notices the blind obedience of a huge majority to its political leaders, no matter how wild the scheme in hand. Dependence on the veto of the House of Lords would probably mean the trusting to a broken reed; for, as a Bill of Disestablishment would be practically a money Bill, it is highly possible that the Upper House would have no *locus standi* to proceed on. That the position of the Church would then be an infinitely worse one than if a more liberal administration had been conceded, is abundantly clear when we consider the enormous revenue it at present draws from tithe, a source which would then become the property of the State. It is the wealth as much as the position of the Church which has excited the envy of Nonconformists, and it is very certain that, unless the Church loses no time in putting its house in order, its wealth will soon be made the subject of *force majeure*.

CARDIGAN.

THE KING'S SPEECH

THE most significant statement in the King's Speech is that the Government are considering the unfortunate differences between the two Houses of Parliament. I wish to discuss this question here, so far as I can, with fairness, and without prejudice. To the House of Lords as an institution all classes in this country, except the working class, are sentimentally attached. Its antiquity, its high, if accidental, reputation as a court of justice, even the splendour which at such opportunities as the meeting of Parliament it displays, are more than respectable, they are impressive. Personally, and in theory, I am what is vulgarly called a Single Chamber man. From 1895 to 1905 the country was governed by the House of Commons, and the Constitution survived the shock. During the first of those quinquennial periods the House of Commons represented chiefly opposition to Home Rule and Local Veto. During the second it represented approval of the South African War. I was in favour of Home Rule and against the war. But I recognise that under a system nominally democratic the will of the majority ought to prevail, and that the British people must take the responsibility for their own decisions. I am even willing to put up with the chance, such as happened in 1900, that an appeal to put patriotism above party may result in the exclusive predominance of one party in the State. Still the fact remains, and it is surely a very important fact, that for ten recent years the House of Commons did what it liked. The House of Lords led an easy, comfortable existence, passing all Ministerial measures with civility and speed, talking a little sometimes about foreign affairs, or the army, or the navy, never putting the smallest difficulty in the way of a Conservative, or, if the name be preferred, a Unionist Administration. People who approve of this arrangement cannot logically defend the bi-cameral system. If they defend it practically, that is because, like the majority of the Lords themselves, they are Conservatives, and support everything which promotes the triumph of the Conservative cause.

To expect that a Liberal shall be contented with this machinery and its working is to expect that he shall be more or less than human, a god or a beast, as Aristotle would say. Last year a Liberal majority

of almost unparalleled dimensions was returned from every part of Great Britain. If we exclude, as merely a passing and precarious episode, the Irish majority of 1892, it was the first time that the Liberal party had been in power for twenty years. During the whole of that time they had proclaimed their belief in the principle that no man should have more than one vote for the House of Commons. Ever since 1902, when Mr. Balfour's Education Act was passed, they had demanded that all schools in receipt of public money should be under public control, and that the religious opinions of no teacher in those schools should be subject to official inquiry. The new Government, which had been formed just before the Election, brought in at once a Plural Voting Bill to carry out the first of these policies, and an Education Bill giving effect to the second. The House of Lords threw out the former measure, though it dealt solely with election to the House of Commons. The latter they amended in such a form that those who brought it in declined to be responsible for it any longer, and it was dropped. The second and third readings of the Education Bill were carried by majorities of two hundred each. The Lords' amendments were rejected by a majority of three hundred. This difference of numbers is explained by the fact that the Irish Nationalists, who speak for the Church of Rome, had been conciliated by the offer of further changes for the benefit of denominational schools. Concessions had already been made before the Bill was introduced, and in both cases they applied to the Church of England as well as to the Church of Rome. They were so extensive that many Nonconformists intimated heavy displeasure, and gave opponents of the Bill occasion to say that it pleased nobody, 'not even Dr. Clifford.' I am not aware of any other instance in English history where the Lords refused to give way before such an overwhelming majority in the other House of Parliament.

Will any fair-minded man, whatever his politics, contend that such a situation is satisfactory, or that the probability of its recurrence can be ignored? Observe that I say nothing about the merits or defects of the Bill. No Tory could think it worse than most Liberals thought the Bill of 1902, which was never before the constituencies in any form. That Bill was the reward of those Dissenters who voted for Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner, thinking that every vote given to a Liberal was given to the Boers, and not knowing that every vote given to a Conservative was given to Convocation. However, that is by the way. If the Nonconformists did not understand the British Constitution, so much the worse for them. They paid dearly for their ignorance. It can hardly be said that they are paying for it now. They were entitled, like the rest of his Majesty's subjects, to assume that the Lords would respect the opinion of their countrymen so recently and so emphatically declared. The Lords have not done so. There must, as it seems to moderate and reasonable persons, be some change in the Constitution. What should it be? A Single Chamber is

almost Utopian. It exists, I believe, nowhere except in Greece, which is not altogether an encouraging example. The Prime Minister, who seldom wastes words, put the point clearly and sensibly in his reply to Mr. Balfour. He declared himself unfavourable to schemes for reforming the composition of the Peers which might make them stronger than ever. The remedy he suggested was to limit their veto, to make it suspensory instead of prohibitive. The essence of the British Constitution he pronounced to be representative government, and from that principle he deduced the corollary that the representative House of Parliament must in the long run prevail. Is not this an eminently fair and wise suggestion? It contains no threat of revolution or destruction. It would leave the House of Lords with the one power which their wisest defenders have always claimed for them, which their most sagacious members have always claimed for themselves, the right, that is to say, of checking undue haste on the part of the Commons. Lord Palmerston, who always treated the Lords with peculiar tenderness, though he would never leave the House of Commons, used to say: 'They may do it once. They had better not do it again.' They threw out the first Reform Bill once. If they had thrown it out again, the King would have created Whig Peers. They threw out the Paper Duty Repeal Bill once. Mr. Gladstone provided by an ingenious change of procedure against their throwing it out again, unless they were prepared, as they were not, to dislocate the whole financial system of the country. That was in the year 1861, and they have not since attempted to interfere with the taxation of the people. At the same time it is true, and it should not be forgotten, that there is a financial aspect of the present crisis. The Education Bill was not technically a Money Bill, because it did not as a whole originate in Committee of Ways and Means, like the Voluntary Schools Bill of 1897. But it dealt entirely, almost exclusively, with the conditions under which public money, whether from rates or from taxes, was to be laid out. The technical part of this question is scarcely suitable to this Review. But if anyone interested in the subject will turn to Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, and read the Resolution of 1678, he will see reason to doubt whether a couple of hundred years ago the Lords would have been suffered without protest to amend the Education Bill at all.

The veto of the Lords cannot of course be constitutionally limited without their own assent. Indeed I doubt whether a Bill for limiting it would not have to be introduced in the House of Lords itself. The Government do not propose in the Speech immediate action. To acknowledge that the Lords had the right, which the Commons have, of forcing the resignation of a Ministry, or in the alternative an appeal to the people, would be to make Liberal Cabinets practically impossible. And if Ministers thought that the loss of the Education Bill obliged them to seek another expression of public opinion, they should have dissolved early in January. That, however, would have been a

foolish, and even a treacherous, course. They received from the country a splendid majority to be used for the purpose of effecting social reforms. When Mr. Gladstone threw away his majority in 1886, he had been defeated in the House of Commons. If the Liberal Government ought, as some think, to have dissolved in 1894, when the Lords mutilated their Bills, it was because they had no real stable following upon which they could rely. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's present strength is colossal. There is no reason to suppose that a single Parliament will exhaust it. But if the Government were to come before the country with a humble, not to say abject, confession, that they could do nothing without a fresh 'mandate,' it is by no means certain that they would get one. People might well ask themselves what was the good of it, and even be tempted to feel as little patience with the men who could not stop in as they felt with the men who would not go out. Even if this extreme consequence did not follow, but the majority were to any serious extent diminished, the Lords would be strengthened rather than weakened by a premature appeal. If this House of Commons cannot solve the problem, no House of Commons can. The resources of the Constitution, however, are far from being exhausted.

Two obvious courses are always open to the Government and the House of Commons in dealing with the Lords. The King's power to make Peers is unlimited, though only once, in 1711, has its actual exercise been required. In 1832 the mere threat sufficed. When it became known that William the Fourth, who ostentatiously hated the Reform Bill, had given Lord Grey written authority to make Lords, 'first calling up peers' eldest sons,' their Lordships gracefully yielded to necessity, and passed the Bill. The ennobling of the eldest sons would of course have avoided, so far as it went, a permanent addition to the Peerage. All that can properly be said of his present Majesty's political opinions is that, unlike William the Fourth, he keeps them to himself. The power of the purse was originally intended to operate against the Crown. Even now a Ministry which remained in office after a hostile vote of the Commons could be driven to resign by the stoppage of supplies. But that is too unlikely a contingency to be regarded as a serious element in the Constitution. The stoppage of supplies cannot be used directly against the House of Lords, nor even indirectly with much practical result. But it is very different with the control of the Commons over Budgets, Estimates, and all the machinery of finance. What Mr. Gladstone did with the Finance Bill, the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill as it used to be called, might be done, I suppose, with the debit as well as the credit side of the ledger, with supply as well as with ways and means. When the Voluntary Schools Bill came before the House of Lords, Lord Halsbury argued that the Peers could not touch it, because it came within the Resolution of 1678 touching the grant and 'management' of aids or supplies. Yet the Voluntary Schools Bill was a money bill only

in name. It had a definite, political, sectarian object—namely, to put the denominational schools in a better pecuniary position than the Board schools. Lord Halsbury prevailed. The Liberal Peers who had put down amendments, not all financial, abstained from moving them, and the Bill came back to the House of Commons without the alteration of a word. A Constitutional purist will perhaps say that the Lords might have thrown it out. But it is nearly half a century since they have taken so violent a course with a Bill of 'aid or supply.' A good deal must depend upon the result in Parliament of the struggle which the House of Lords has provoked. But the Prime Minister speaks with authority, and he has indicated the unlimited veto as the ultimate object of attack.

It is Pulcinello's secret that Mr. Balfour induced the Lords to insist upon their amendments of the Education Bill. He bore down the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Duke of Devonshire. He carried his point. There is something dramatic in these sudden reversals of fortune. Last January Mr. Balfour shattered his party and lost his seat. Last December he used the House of Lords to defeat the principal measure of the Session, and override the decision of a House just elected by the country. No one who saw it is likely to forget the dramatic scene in the House of Commons at the close of the debate on the Lords' amendments, when Mr. Birrell's most humorous and conciliatory speech, which was to have been final, was followed by a passionate diatribe from the Leader of the Opposition, intended to shut the door against all reasonable compromise. That he was right from his own point of view in taking this course it would be rash to deny. Mr. Balfour, for all his airs of detached indifference, is an astute politician, and he has certainly succeeded in making himself the only possible leader of the Conservative party to-day. No demonstration of his personal power could have been more effective, for it was notorious that the Tariff Reformers wanted the Education Bill out of their path. But what had the House of Lords to do with that? It was their business, according to the theory of the Constitution, to act as unbiassed critics of the Bill, not to further the views of a section or a chief elsewhere. Defence of the Lords as they are supposed to be is easy enough. Defence of them as they are is more difficult, and is, indeed, seldom attempted. Abuse of them, even if it were justified, would be futile. Hard words, as they break no bones, so they mend no constitutions. The Peers act as other men would act in similar circumstances with the same privileges. Nobody denies that they are patriotic, intelligent, conscientious. Nobody can assert that they are impartial. They are party men, like members of the House of Commons. But whereas the House of Commons periodically changes, the House of Lords is always the same. The disparity between the two Houses has never been greater than it is to-day, and it derived additional emphasis from the fact that, whereas the Lords' amendments to the Education

Bill were rejected in a full House, the Lords who finally insisted on them, thus wrecking the Bill, were not more than a third of their whole number. How to deal with this anomaly is a question which doubtless requires very careful thought. That to deal with it in some manner is necessary cannot be disputed by anyone who believes in representative government at all.

Mr. Balfour, in the debate on the Address, referred to Lord Salisbury's plain declaration in the House of Lords, when he voted for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, that the will of the people must prevail.

The King's Speech contains the expected announcement of a Bill for administrative reform in Ireland. Not Home Rule, but Devolution, is the fashionable formula. What's in a name? Home Rule may be called Devolution; Devolution may be called Home Rule. The important point is that there will be no attempt on this occasion to establish a separate Parliament for Ireland. To do so would be a breach of faith with those Unionists who voted last year for Liberalism and Free Trade. It would exceed the functions of the present House of Commons, which was not elected with reference to Gladstonian Home Rule. The Prime Minister, before the Dissolution, even before he took office, made his own position perfectly clear. He remained, he said, of the same opinion that he held in 1886 and in 1893. He thought that Irish aspirations, with which he sympathised, could be fully satisfied by an Irish Parliament alone. The time, however, was not suitable for so great a change, and he should therefore support such a measure of reform in the Irish Executive as Mr. Balfour was understood as Prime Minister to favour. Mr. Balfour repudiates this construction of his policy, and the precise meaning of it is immaterial. He is no longer responsible for Irish affairs, and his successor, at all events, is prepared to accept the views understood to be implied in the appointment of Sir Antony MacDonnell. The language of Lord Lansdowne on this point in the House of Lords was singularly moderate. He should look, he said, at any scheme of alteration in Irish government to see whether it impaired the actual supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Birrell, who delights the House as Chief Secretary no less than he delighted it as Minister of Education, observed in his first Irish speech that, whatever his Bill might be, his predecessor, Mr. Walter Long, would denounce it as a step to Home Rule. It may be so. On the other hand, it may be that a refusal of all change would be a much quicker step in the same direction. That matter, as Mr. Gladstone once said, must make its own proof. The present chaos of Irish administration, so eloquently described by Mr. Redmond on the opening night of the Session, is beyond apology or excuse. The mover of the address quoted a famous speech made by the late Lord Salisbury when he was Lord Robert Cecil. With a wisdom beyond his years, the future Premier went through all possible causes of Irish

stagnation, and rejected them one by one, until he came, by an exhaustive process, to the government of England. It is quite true that since that speech was made Parliament has disestablished the Irish Church, and passed quite a number of Land Acts. Yet Irishmen are not allowed to control their own administration and finance, although they have shown in their Town and County Councils their competence for civic and municipal life. Even an Ulster Unionist, such as Mr. Long has become, can hardly maintain that this sort of Home Rule, gas and water Home Rule as it used to be contemptuously called, is fatal to the unity of the Empire, or the integrity of the United Kingdom. Mr. Redmond and the Nationalists will, of course, not be satisfied with it. But, being practical men, they will take it for what it is worth, and make the best of it. Difficulty is most likely to arise over taxation, for the fiscal union of the three countries is an important thing. The whole subject bristles with difficulties, though an Executive Council is a much simpler affair than a subordinate Legislature. It is fortunate that the Government do not depend upon the Irish vote, and can therefore act with firmness as well as with justice. Everybody remembers the emphasis which Mr. Gladstone laid upon this independence two-and-twenty years ago. At the General Election of 1885 he implored the voters of Great Britain to give him a majority large enough to counterbalance Mr. Parnell's followers. 'Do not,' he said, in effect, 'do not compel us to deal with the Irish question when the Irish members can say to us, "Unless you do this or that we will turn you out to-morrow."' Lord Randolph Churchill was very sarcastic over this appeal, and said it was a fine practical result of enfranchising the Irish labourers to ask for the power of voting them down. The appeal, as we know, met with an unfavourable response. Mr. Gladstone was never again independent of the Irish vote, and was never able to carry Home Rule. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is in a far happier and securer position, for his followers have a majority in the House of Commons over all other parties combined. He has himself been Chief Secretary for Ireland, and in Mr. Birrell he has a colleague acceptable to every party in the House. It is a great opportunity. Home Rulers may be disappointed to find that executive devolution does not lead to the success of their larger policy. Unionists, on the other hand, by being brought nearer to Home Rule, may lose some of the dread and distrust with which it now inspires them. At any rate, the experiment, under proper safeguards is surely worth trying. What those safeguards should be, and how far Mr. Birrell's Bill provides them, will be proper and legitimate subjects for debate in Parliament. It must not, of course, be forgotten that this House of Commons was elected to carry social reforms. The constitutional conflict which the Lords have raised was neither expected nor desired. Perhaps it ought to have been expected. But there were reasons why it should not be. For ten years the House of Lords had completely

effaced itself. Its last great exertion of power in 1893 was made against a Government numerically weak and actually without a British majority. Liberals naturally thought that the Lords would not at once begin to work against the decisive results of a General Election. They were mistaken. But it is their duty, before trying conclusions in the country, to use the power given them for the purposes for which they were entrusted with it. The tumult of a General Election is not favourable to clear political thinking, nor is an appeal to the country required to ensure the preponderance of the representative principle. If it were, we should have annual Parliaments for Liberal Administrations, and the Septennial Act for Conservatives, which is absurd.[1]

What Mr. Birrell justly called the 'historic occasion' of the debate on Mr. Hayden's amendment to the address may have important consequences even in the near future. The delay in reinstating evicted tenants under the Act of 1903 is dangerous to the peace of Ireland, and discreditable to the honour of Parliament. Mr. Redmond's cordial reception of the Chief Secretary's speech was due not so much to Mr. Birrell's genial and sympathetic humour as to his definite assurance of early legislation, and his manly acknowledgment that an inhuman landlord was a public nuisance. It was natural that Mr. Redmond should be pleased. The event of the debate was the sudden conversion of Mr. Walter Long. Mr. Long did nothing for the evicted tenants when he was Chief Secretary; but, as he said himself, it is useless to go back upon that, and much better to bury the hatchet. Mr. Long is a party man, an out-and-out Tory. But he is eminently honourable, candid, and sincere. What he says he means, and what he promises he will perform. Ulster member though he be, and Leader of the Ulster Unionists, he is free from religious bigotry, and imbued with the sound traditions of public life in England. He knows perfectly well that the restoration of these evicted tenants to their holdings is essential for the peace and prosperity of the Irish people. Mr. Birrell can now count upon his support, and therefore any legislation which the Government proposes for the relief of evicted tenants is likely to pass without serious opposition in either House of Parliament. As much cannot, of course, be said for the University Bill, or the Executive Council Bill. But neither of these measures is so urgent a problem as the just treatment of a landless and discontented population with an indisputable grievance. It is difficult to suppose that three Irish Bills will pass this year, and there can be no doubt that the Evicted Tenants Bill is the most important of the three.

HERBERT PAUL.

[1] This sentence was written before Mr. Birrell made the identical remark in the House of Commons.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY *cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER



No. CCCLXIII—May 1907

THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE

My distinguished successor in the Prime Ministership of Canada has during these past few memorable days asserted with a persuasiveness all his own that the British Empire 'rests upon foundations firmer than the rock and as endurable as the ages.' It is a comforting reflection, but none the less, looking back over a long public career in this country and in Canada, am I convinced that it is only by a tenacious hold upon central British ideals and by a steadfast pursuit of the policy these suggest that the British Empire can be preserved from the disintegrating influences that have overwhelmed so many of the Empires of the past.

Sir John Seeley has asserted that the British Empire was won in a 'fit of absentmindedness,' and we are ready enough to believe that in some way or other we shall continue to 'muddle through' and persist as a governing and idealising force in the world. We trust to the seemingly inevitable trend of British and Colonial tendencies towards closer unity. That the 'inevitable trend' is there we may thankfully believe, but the more we learn of the inner history of former times the more we realise how much method there also was in the 'absentmindedness' of the Empire-builders of the days of

Queen Elizabeth and William Pitt. And the guiding hand of statesmanship is as surely necessary now as then.

Outside the British Empire, Germany and the United States are recognised as the most progressive and enlightened industrial nations, and it is not unprofitable at times to see ourselves as others see us. Professor Carl Johannes Fuchs, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Freiburg, one of the most distinguished of German economists, in his great work on the Trade Policy of various countries, declares that

> the British Empire, more than any other nation in Europe, is capable of becoming a self-sufficient commercial state, and the political and commercial issues are so bound together that it might be advisable for the Mother Country to purchase political advantages even at the cost of some economic sacrifices. On political and economical grounds [he adds] England needs now more than ever to retain her great Colonial Empire. Owing to the numerous and active centrifugal forces of to-day, this can only be done by a closer union, which will be worth any cost.

And writing in 1891 he makes the following striking prophetic declaration:

> It remains to be seen whether time will raise up to England a statesman who possesses clear-sightedness, courage, energy, and tact enough to bring this question to a happy issue—a question which is of so much importance for the future of England, as well for her position among nations as for her trade. But it must be soon, or it will be for ever too late.

It would be easy to find confirmation of Professor Fuchs's diagnosis in the recent policy of Germany, and especially her determined though happily frustrated effort to compel Canada to extend to her the tariff preference granted in 1897 to the United Kingdom. It is enough to quote what was said in the course of a speech to the German 'Intellectuals' at Berlin on the 12th of January, 1907, when Herr Dernburg, Colonial Director, urged that Germany must develop, and develop forthwith, a trade policy applicable to the whole German Empire similar to that policy of Imperial reciprocity which is now before the British people.

Look from Germany to the United States, and we find Mr. J. J. Hill, the well-known railway president, and one of the master-minds of the United States of to-day, declaring in a speech at the Merchants' Club, Chicago, on the 10th of November, 1906, that the overthrow of Imperial Preference at the British General Election of 1906 had given the United States one further chance. Had that policy been ratified, he said,

> had England really granted to the Colonies a preference in its markets for their products based on reciprocal advantages, this country [the United States] would have felt the double thrust in a decline of business with its greatest and its third greatest customers on two sides of the Atlantic. The defeat of the plan has not greatly disappointed the dependencies [he went on to say], but it has assured them that for the present they must seek commercial alliances elsewhere.

And he added :

> It is, perhaps, the time when [United States] reciprocity with Canada may be considered with more favour than it ever can be again. For no man who understands industrial conditions in Great Britain will believe that the issue raised by Chamberlain is permanently settled, or that unrest and distress there will not at some future time bring it again to the front with better prospects of success.

These are pregnant words, and if we turn to the history of the movement for the consolidation of the Empire we see how full that history is both of encouragement and warning. We realise at once how free the movement was in its earlier stages from political partisanship. It was Mr. W. E. Forster, the Cabinet colleague of Gladstone and Bright, who organised the momentous meeting of 1884, and it was Mr. W. H. Smith, the Conservative First Lord of the Treasury, who moved, and Lord Rosebery, the Liberal Prime Minister of later years, who seconded, the unanimous resolution 'that in order to secure the permanent unity of the Empire, some form of federation is essential.' In consequence of that resolution the Imperial Federation League came to birth. It thrived for a time on aspirations and eloquence and did the Empire this decisive service -- by an exhaustive examination of the question and after communicating with leading men throughout the Empire it proved the impracticability of Parliamentary federation. That rock of disunion was for the future clearly marked on the chart of Empire. The League met its end when several of its members proposed to weld the British Empire together by a policy of Imperial defence based upon proportionate Colonial contributions to the Navy. The recent debate in the British House of Commons shows that this policy has its advocates to-day. Can they hope to fare better than did their predecessors of twenty years ago ?

It so happens that at a dinner of the Imperial Federation League in 1889, before I became a member of it, when asked my opinion, I ventured to suggest that a conference should be invited from the self-governing Colonies to discuss with the Imperial Government the subject of federation, and I added that I hoped the result would be that it might be found practicable to adopt a fiscal policy that would be mutually beneficial to the Mother Country and the Colonies. Lord Rosebery, then President of the League, consulted the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, and it was decided to postpone such conference, pending the efforts then being made to confederate Australia.

The next step forward was taken some time afterwards when, in response to an appeal from the United Empire Trade League, Lord Salisbury said :

> Before we can formulate any propositions or before we can invite our Colonies to any kind of federation, what it is we have to know is how far the people of this country would be disposed to support a policy of which I imagine

the most prominent features are preferential taxes on corn, meat and wool. Some people may say you can have these preferential taxes without any increase of prices to the consumer. . . . On these matters public opinion must be formed before any Government can act. No Government can impose its own opinion on the people of the country in these matters. It is the duty of those who feel themselves to be the leaders of such a movement and the apostles of such a doctrine to go forth and fight for it, and when they have convinced the people of the country the battle will be won.

Lord Salisbury's advice was taken, and it is only necessary to contemplate the main theme of the Colonial Conference of 1907 and the recent proceedings of such representative commercial bodies as the Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom and of the whole Empire to appreciate the undiminished vigour with which the fight is still being waged and the steady advance that has been made.

In 1892 the second Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire rejected by a large majority after two days' debate the preferential resolution which I had the privilege of moving, and which Sir Donald A. Smith (now Lord Strathcona) seconded. It called for 'a slight differential duty by the Imperial and Colonial Governments in favour of the home productions against the imported foreign article.' Two years later, in 1894, the Colonial Conference held at Ottawa, with Lord Jersey as the representative of the Imperial Government, pronounced in favour of mutual preferential trade between the United Kingdom and the Colonies. Again in 1896, when I was Prime Minister of Canada, the question was made one of the most important issues in my appeal to the electors.

The sequel is instructive and suggestive. Mr. Laurier (now the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the leader of the Opposition, publicly declared himself to be as strongly in favour of mutual preferential trade as I was, and from that time it ceased to be an issue in Canada, where all parties are united in its support. Few as the remaining years of my life must be, I hope to see the day when the same may be said of the United Kingdom.

The enactment of the Canadian preference followed, and the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties brought the question within the Imperial arena. By his Budget of 1901 Sir Michael Hicks-Beach restored the registration duty of one shilling per hundredweight on imported corn, and thereby enriched the British Treasury by an increased revenue of 2½ millions sterling without a suggestion of inconvenience to the British consumer. The Canadian offer of 1902 followed. At the Colonial Conference of that year Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding, the Finance Minister, offered to increase the preference of 33⅓ per cent. accorded to the United Kingdom if Canada were exempted from the registration duties and any similar future duties, and stated that if this modicum of response to Canada's preference were refused, Canada would feel at liberty to review the whole question. We know how, in the absence of Mr. Chamberlain in

South Africa, Mr. Ritchie, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, induced the British Cabinet to neglect Canada's offer and repeal the duties.

Then it was that Mr. Chamberlain in his historic speech at Birmingham on the 16th of May, 1902, committed himself irrevocably to the policy of Preference and resigned his high office in the Ministry, that he might more effectively advocate what he knew to be essential to the unity of the Empire. Severe illness, the result of his Herculean labours, has for the time deprived the movement of his inspiring leadership, but in his New Year message to the people of Canada, through the medium of that constant friend of the Empire, the Montreal *Star*, Mr. Chamberlain has again affirmed his profound conviction that 'of all the bonds that can unite nations, the bond of commerce is the strongest, and the perception of that fact will, I feel assured, ultimately lead to the closer union between Great Britain and her Colonies, which I conceive to be the only foundation for a great Empire.'

Idealism and enlightened self-interest form an unconquerable partnership, and the movement goes forward to certain victory. The defeat in the Congress of Chambers of the Empire in 1902 was turned into overwhelming victory in the Congress of 1906, when 105 Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade representing every part of the Empire supported, and only forty-one Chambers rejected, the policy of reciprocal preference as a matter of 'present practical importance.' Among the twenty-one neutral Chambers was the London Chamber of Commerce, but in March of this year at a meeting of over 200 members its neutrality was turned into an emphatic adherence, and at the subsequent poll 1,077 votes were recorded for and 472 against the proposal of commercial unity on a preferential basis and such revenue duties on imported manufactures as would safeguard British industries from the unfair competition of foreign countries.

Thus the progress of the movement is apparent. All the self-governing Colonies are now united, and there is abundant evidence of the change in British public opinion. I admit the difficulty caused by the attitude of the Liberal party, but we cannot doubt the desire of the present Government to go as far as they can to meet the wishes of the Colonies. As Lord Milner has pointed out, the Government are in no way committed to oppose a reduction of existing taxation in favour of the Colonies. They might thus give a preference to all the Colonies except Canada, and a restoration of the registration duty on corn, the preferential admission of which would of course bring Canada and India into the scheme, would in no way conflict with the principles of Free Trade as Peel, Gladstone, and members of the present Government have understood and approved of them. Nor would the interests of the consumer be prejudiced, for it is a curious fact that the price of wheat was greater both in the year before Sir Michael Hicks-Beach imposed his duties and in the year after

Mr. Ritchie repealed them than while they were in operation. No one pretends that the registration duties would advance the price of bread, and their restoration while increasing the revenue would enable the Government to meet the demand of Sir Wilfrid Laurier quite consistently with their principles.

Moreover, discrimination between 'foreign' and 'colonial' is not new in the fiscal relations of Colony and Mother Country. I do not now refer to the tariff preferences of Corn Law days, but to the acceptance of the principle by both Liberal and Unionist Chancellors of the Exchequer of our own time. When Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, brought in a bill to increase from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 10*s.* the tax on securities, we, the representatives of the self-governing Colonies, waited upon him and pointed out that the loans were used to develop portions of the Empire, and he amended the Bill by exempting the Colonies from that additional taxation—thus establishing discrimination in favour of the Colonies, and in doing so removing the stigma from the act which characterised colonists as foreigners. Again when Sir William Harcourt brought in his measure increasing the succession duties, the representatives of the Colonies, after two lengthy interviews, succeeded in inducing him to amend the Bill in respect to colonists domiciled in Great Britain by providing that only the balance after deducting the Colonial duty should be claimed. It was moreover declared that no writ for the collection of these taxes should run in a British Colony.

It has been suggested in authoritative quarters that the admission of the principle of preference would be the thin end of the wedge. I have shown that the principle has already been admitted by both Liberal and Conservative statesmen, and is now a part of the law of England. May I also urge, as others have urged, that there is another wedge with a thin end—a wedge that is calculated to drive the Colonies further from the United Kingdom in a commercial sense, and nearer to the foreigner, whose natural aim it is to displace more and more the British manufacturer and artisan? It is needless to do more than quote the formal announcement made in the Canadian Senate so recently as the 11th of April last by Sir Richard Cartwright, Acting Prime Minister in the absence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He then declared that 'after the Imperial Conference, Canadian Ministers would take the opportunity to approach several European countries in an endeavour to improve trade relations. This would be the first use of the recently passed intermediate tariff.' The effect of the Intermediate Tariff enactment is twofold. It permits Canadian Ministers to negotiate and conclude reciprocity with foreign nations without recourse to the agency of the Imperial Government, and even without reference to their own Parliament; and it automatically admits these foreign nations to a part of the preference

in Canadian markets now enjoyed by the United Kingdom. Moreover, it is more than conceivable that in the course of negotiation with the astute industrial rivals of the United Kingdom, Canada may be led so to fix and limit the margin of British preference as to bar the way to any future arrangement of mutual preference within the Empire.

Need more be said to prove the danger of the policy of drift? Is it conceivable that, with these perfectly natural developments of Colonial commercial policy staring her in the face, the Mother Country will persist in her refusal of reciprocity? In the words of Professor Fuchs, 'it must be soon or it will be for ever too late.'

Passing to another of the main subjects of Imperial discussion, namely, the constitution and perpetuation of the Imperial Conference, I find myself in substantial agreement with what I conceive to be the views of Canadian Ministers. The term 'Council' is liable to misconstruction as applied to a body which does no more than confer, and has no executive functions, and I cannot see why anyone should object to the word 'Conference.' It is essentially an Imperial Conference inasmuch as the Colonies are invited by the Imperial Government to confer with them. Nor can I see any valid objection to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's claim that other members of his Government should take part in the Conference with the full status of membership. The object of the Conference is obviously a discussion between the Imperial and the Colonial Governments in order to arrive at results on important questions between them. The presence, therefore, of important members of his Government would enable the Prime Minister of each Colony to act with more confidence and arrive at results which would otherwise have to be postponed. They are all sworn members of Government, and their presence as members of the Conference can only be beneficial. I cannot indeed see why all the members of the Imperial Government and all the members of the Colonial Governments should not be members of the Imperial Conference. The question of voting does not arise, and if and when it does arise it can be settled by the Conference itself.

I am also in agreement with Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the attitude of opposition he is assumed to take up respecting the active agitation carried on for some time in favour, ostensibly, of effecting the continuity of the Conference during the intervals between its meetings. The appointment of a permanent Commission in London has been advocated for the following reasons:

> After a few crowded weeks of activity its members (*i.e.* the members of the Conference) separate and the organisation remains in abeyance for several years. During those years Imperial questions which may be delicate and even critical may arise from time to time, and no special and adequate machinery set up for discussing them or even enquiring into them can be resorted to. . . .

But no guarantee exists for the full and regular exchange of opinion on any question by the division of the Empire interested therein. . . . There is no such thing as a department of the Empire in which English and Colonial knowledge, experience and thinking power can meet to examine Imperial problem and co-operate to solve them.

These and many more or less similar fallacies have been constantly reiterated. If they were not fallacies the condition of communication between the Imperial and Colonial Governments has been and is deplorable indeed.

I propose to state briefly some of the facts within my own knowledge which show the inaccuracy of these statements? The self-governing Colonies have for many years past been represented in London by Agents-General or High Commissioners who with a staff of able men under them have maintained communication between the Colonial and Imperial Governments.

I had the honour of representing Canada as High Commissioner for thirteen years. During that time there were several changes of Government here, and I am bound to say that whichever Government was in power the representations of the Colonial Governments received the most prompt and attentive consideration from not only the Colonial Minister of the day but all the other ministers including the Prime Minister, whenever the occasion required us to communicate with them. If it were a matter affecting one Colony, it was dealt with by the representative of that Colony, but if it were a question affecting the other Colonies as well, all the Colonial representatives met at the Canadian Office and having agreed on the line to be taken we went in a body to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, or where the question affected another department an interview would be arranged for us there.

It is of vital importance at this moment of suggested changes to bear these pertinent facts in mind. The purpose in view in the formation of a new and permanent Commission has for many years been practically accomplished through existing channels with a signal absence of friction and a signal measure of success. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other Colonial ministers have pointed to one instance and another in British diplomacy in which Colonial interests have not been sufficiently safeguarded. It would need more space than I have at command to analyse each of these cases, but it may be stated as a general proposition that in not a few of them other influences and in some of them Colonial influences and the actions of Colonial ministers themselves must bear their share of the responsibility of subsequent failure. It is doubtful if any permanent council or commission sitting in London would have bettered the result; but it is certain that the result would in each of the matters of Colonial complaint have been most materially and beneficially affected had full and free use been made of the existing means of direct and con-

fidential diplomatic intercourse between the Imperial and Colonial Governments.

I will give a few of the illustrations that have come under my immediate observation.

When my predecessor, the late Sir A. T. Galt, was High Commissioner, the Government of Canada applied to the Imperial Government to arrange for his presence at negotiations with foreign Governments relating to Canadian trade. The request was refused. Upon my succession to the High Commissionership I took the question up with the Government here, with the result that I was appointed by her Majesty to negotiate in conjunction with Sir Clare Ford a treaty between Spain and Canada, and Lord Salisbury's instructions were that the negotiations should be conducted by the Canadian High Commissioner with all the aid that the British Ambassador could give. The right to negotiate commercial treaties by the autonomous Colonies was thus established.

Lord Rosebery as Foreign Minister gave similar instructions when Lord Dufferin and I were appointed plenipotentiaries by her Majesty to negotiate the Franco-Canadian Treaty which was subsequently ratified by the French Chambers and the Canadian Parliament.

As far back as 1890—that is, seven years before the Canadian preference—the representatives of all the Colonies urged upon the Imperial Government the abrogation of the Belgian and German Treaties, and were assured that they would be modified on the first opportunity that offered. At the Colonial Conference of 1897 and at the instance of Mr. Chamberlain all the Colonies united in a resolution and, as we know, the treaties were subsequently abrogated. Again the demand of the Colonial representatives that the law preventing mutual trade arrangements between the Australian Governments should be repealed was complied with.

At the International Conference held at Paris for the protection of submarine cables, in which twenty-five Powers took part, I was appointed to represent Canada, and I was clothed with as independent an authority as the Ambassador who represented Germany. Indeed, on one important point I felt it my duty as the representative of Canada to vote with certain of the foreign Powers against the whole of the British delegation. Moreover all the representatives of the Colonies in London took part in the International Customs Conference held at Brussels, and the International Postal and other Conferences. Nor is it to be forgotten that the position of the Colonial representatives was recognised in most effective manner at the time of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886. The Colonial representatives were made members of the Royal Commission of which his Majesty (then Prince of Wales) was the executive-president, and was untiring in his personal devotion to the work of administration. The financial results of the exhibition were most gratifying; six millions of people

visited it, and it brought a new revelation of Colonial resources and potentialities.

I have already referred to the effective intervention of the Colonial representatives with successive Chancellors of the Exchequer in regard to the tax on securities and the incidence of the succession duties. Many other illustrations might be given of the close contact between the Colonial and Imperial administrations which is afforded through the medium of the Colonial High Commissioners and Agents-General. The subjects in respect of which co-operation has been thus effected or promoted include the addition of Colonial securities to the Trust Fund List, the Pacific Cable, the Imperial recognition of the Canadian Mail Route to the Far East, and many more.

It is the peculiar genius of the British race to build upon what has gone before, to broaden down from precedent to precedent, and the foregoing illustrations of the usefulness of the machinery we already possess surely carry their own moral. In this Review of February 1885 that far-sighted statesman, Mr. W. E. Forster, said :

> Lord Grey has repeated in the *Pall Mall Gazette* the suggestion which he made in this Review in 1879, viz. the appointment of the Agents of the Colonies as Privy Councillors and their constitution as a Board of Advise to assist the Cabinet and especially the Colonial Secretary in the management of Colonial affairs; and Lord Lorne has defined this suggestion and given excellent arguments in support. It would be difficult to find any proposal supported by so great a weight of experience as this agreement between the veteran Minister, who has an unmatched experience of the Colonial Office, and the man who has just returned from successful government of our largest Colony.

The late Lord Thring, who spoke with peculiar authority, in his brochure on the 'Consolidation of the British Empire' said, 'The direct intervention of a Colony may be secured by elevating the position of an Agent-General to one more akin to that of a foreign State and giving him a facility of access to the British Government.'

Having during four years represented Canada as High Commissioner while I at the same time held a seat in the Canadian Cabinet, I found in discussing matters with the Imperial Government the additional weight given to my representations from the fact that I was not only a representative of the Canadian Government but also a member of it. Would it not be to the obvious and great advantage of all parties concerned if the offices of the High Commissioners of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa when confederated, were made departments of their respective Colonial Governments and held by members of their respective Cabinets? I see that the suggestion is one that commends itself to Lord Milner after his long and brilliant career as a Proconsul. For obvious reasons the connexion of these great outlying portions of the Empire with the Mother Country must be diplomatic, and to be successful of the most secret and confidential character.

The Conference composed of all the members of all the Cabinets

including the High Commissioners could employ any experts they desired to collect or collate information on any special subject, and looking at the suggestion as a whole I fail to see in what way the continuity of the proceedings of the Conference could be more effectively carried on.

There remains the question of defence. It is known that from the outset I have felt the interests of Canada and the true interests of the Empire to be opposed to the demand for Colonial contributions to the Imperial Navy. Those loudest in that demand admit that a voice in administration by the Colony contributing is essential, and all the naval experts concur in the opinion that any division of authority would be fatal.

But this is not for one moment to say that each Colony should not contribute to the extent of its ability to the defence of the Empire. I hold strongly that it should, and I maintain that Canada has discharged that duty in the manner most conducive to Imperial interests.

It is essential to make quite clear what is a Colony's duty in this matter of Imperial Defence. Upon that point there is no greater authority than the Duke of Devonshire, who, when the Imperial Government appointed a Colonial Defence Committee, was placed at its head. When the Duke delivered his inaugural address as President of the British Empire League, he laid down in the most *ex cathedra* manner the relative duties of the Imperial and the Colonial Governments in regard to the defence of the Empire. Here are his words, and they are vital to the present discussion :

A body is now in existence—has been for many years in existence—called the Colonial Defence Committee, composed of representatives of the Admiralty, the War Office, and the Colonial Office; that body has made a complete study of the question of Colonial Defence as it affects every Colony of the British Empire. It has studied the question from the point of view of each Colony; and every Colony, whether it be a Crown Colony or a self-governing Colony, is now in possession of the views of her Majesty's Government as to the nature of the attack—the possible attack—to which any of them may be exposed, and as to the means of defence which it is possible to oppose to such attack. Every Colonial Government now knows what the Imperial Government is prepared to undertake in their defence, and what must be left to themselves to undertake. Now, although the instructions to this Committee, and the plans which this Committee has prepared, are, and must be, to a very great extent, of a confidential character, yet I am permitted to make a public announcement of the principles upon which those plans are based; so that not only the public at home, but every one of our Colonial fellow-subjects should know how much it is that the Government are prepared to undertake in the defence of the Colonies, and the duties which in their turn they think ought to be undertaken by the Colonies themselves. These principles are as follows : The maintenance of sea supremacy has been assumed as the basis of the system of Imperial Defence against attack from over the sea. This is the determining factor in shaping the whole defensive policy of the Empire, and is fully recognised by the Admiralty, who have accepted the responsibility of protecting all British territory abroad against organised invasion from the sea.

This speech was made in the Guildhall on the 3rd of December, 1896, and provides the foundation of Imperial Defence policy. On the 29th of the following April, the Duke delivered an address to the British Empire League at Eastbourne in which he said :—

> We have undertaken, we are undertaking, and we shall I believe continue to undertake and maintain our Navy so as to be of sufficient strength, not only to defend our own island, but all our possessions in every part of the world. But we cannot undertake to provide for the land defences of our Colonies, especially when they attain the dimensions of the Australian Colonies.

Now I ask in what regard has Canada failed to discharge the duty allotted to her by the Colonial Defence Committee of the British Government, and which the President of that Committee stated he had been permitted to announce to the world as the well-considered and settled policy of the Imperial Government ?

'Canada protects her fisheries by her own cruisers, and when the Imperial Government expressed a wish to be relieved of the expense of maintaining the strategic points at the harbours of Halifax and Esquimalt, the Canadian Government at once relieved them of that large expenditure amounting to 185,000*l.* per annum, and assumed it themselves. The Empire can be best defended by strengthening its weakest part. What did the Hon. Elihu Root, the Secretary of State of the United States, say a few weeks ago at Ottawa ? 'It is full forty years since I paid my first visit to Canada. During that time what wonderful things we have seen. We have seen feeble, ill-compacted, separate dependent Colonies growing into a great and vigorous nation.' It is pertinent to ask by what means and at whose charge that great change has been brought about.

The Canadian history of the past four decades is full of reminders of the difficulties which had to be overcome in the pursuit of the policy from which Canada and the Empire at large are now reaping such ample fruit. As recently as 1880 the Hon. Edward Blake, then leader of the Opposition to Sir John Macdonald's Government, moved a resolution in the Canadian House of Commons to compel the Government to suspend the construction of the railway on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains, and implored the House not to ruin Canada for the sake of 10,000 white people in British Columbia. He had the justification that the line of railway as then located did not intersect any community of 100 white men from Ontario to the Pacific Ocean. Yet in six years from that date Canada had an unbroken line of rail communication from Halifax on the Atlantic to Vancouver on the Pacific. What was then a desert, the abode of Indians and wild animals, has become one of the world's granaries and last year yielded a revenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of over sixty-one million dollars. Two other transcontinental railways are now being vigorously prosecuted, while Canada as a whole has to-day a larger mileage of railway per head of her

population than the United States and this year will add 7,000 miles more to that already constructed.

Earl Grey, the distinguished Governor-General of Canada, said at a banquet given to him in Winnipeg, 'You have this year raised in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, ninety million bushels of wheat, and he would be a bold man who would venture the statement that you have not ten acres of equally good land left for every one that supplied those ninety million bushels.' Hundreds of thousands of hardy settlers are annually pouring into that country, which will soon become the world's greatest food reservoir; and it is no vain boast to say that the child is already born who will live to see Canada furnish happy British homes for as large a population as Great Britain now possesses.

So much has already been accomplished in the creation of a virile and compact British community in Canada, and the work of national and Imperial upbuilding still goes on.

That accomplished soldier, Lord Dundonald, delivered an address at the Canadian Club in Ottawa, a few years ago, in which he outlined a system of citizen soldiery in all its details: a system which, he declared, would when completed enable Canada to defend herself against even the United States. This policy is being steadily pursued by the present Government. Canadians rejoice that the utmost good feeling exists between the two nations who divide the North American continent, and hope that good feeling will ever continue, but the ability to defend is the first element of national life. It is repugnant to every free man—and Canada is a land of free men—to be obliged to feel that he owes the security of his property, his liberty, and his life, to the good nature of a foreign country.

In view of these facts am I not justified in saying that in no portion of the British Empire has more been done to strengthen its weakest part than in Canada?

Need I further remind you that during the unhappy Transvaal War Canada contributed 8,000 men to the support of the British arms. The quarrel was not of Canada's making; no part of any resultant material benefit could possibly be hers; but the Motherland was involved and the cause of Empire was imperilled, and that was enough. In the course of the year 1899 it was my good fortune to address fifty-six large meetings in Canada, extending from Sydney in the east to Victoria on the Pacific coast, and in every one there were cheers to the echo of the statement that when Parliament met I would move that the entire cost of that force should be paid by Canada. Only the action of the Prime Minister in laying on the table of the House evidence that the Imperial Government would not permit Canada to pay the whole cost prevented me from redeeming that pledge and doing what an overwhelming majority of the Canadian people would have desired. When a motion was made in the House of

Commons disapproving of the aid given by Canada in that struggle, after an eloquent speech by Sir Wilfrid Laurier only three votes in a House of 215 members could be found in support of the motion. Such indeed was the national spirit that a wealthy Canadian friend who will not allow me to disclose his name enabled me to insure the lives and limbs of the first contingent of a thousand men to the extent of a million dollars, and forty thousand dollars were subsequently paid to the sufferers under that insurance. Three hundred thousand dollars were subscribed and paid in addition out of the Minto Fund to the other sufferers.

Remembering all this, who will venture to say that Canada has failed in her duty to the Empire? And by the past the future may be confidently forecast.

Mr. Balfour told a vast audience in the Albert Hall last month that he would have the British people think of the self-governing communities of the Empire as a family, and the parallel is true. May I, as one who has spent a lifetime in the public service of the senior member of that family outside the United Kingdom, be allowed to claim that in her own sphere and in respect especially of trade and defence Canada has done what in her lies to realise the family ideal? Indeed did not all the Colonies receive the other day from the greatest Colonial administrator of modern times—I refer to Mr. Chamberlain—his testimony to the fact that if the union of the British Empire is now brought within the range of practical politics 'this great development we owe more to the sister states than we do to ourselves. They,' he added, in his letter of the 13th of April, 1907, 'have seen further and more clearly than we have how necessary it is that we should go forward if we would not go back.'

Mr. Chamberlain in penning that testimony may perhaps have had in mind the undoubted fact that the spontaneous support given to the Mother Country at the time of the Boer War by the outlying portions of the Empire was a potent factor in preventing an intervention on the part of foreign powers with results which it is not pleasant to contemplate. The Colonies make their general and consistent acceptance of the family ideal the basis of no claim—they would spurn to do so; but it does entitle their counsel as to the future of the Empire to the full and sympathetic consideration of the Government and people of this country. We live in moving times; the issues of to-day are of the gravest import; and if the Colonial Conference of 1907 has done nothing else it has evidenced the deep anxiety of the men of our blood overseas who share with the British people what Lord Rosebery has called the title-deeds of the race that nothing shall now be done and nothing now be left undone to jeopardise for them and their children's children the right to share with Sir John Macdonald the proud distinction 'A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die.'

CHARLES TUPPER.

WILL THE BRITISH EMPIRE STAND OR FALL?

THREE centuries ago England was a backward and ignorant agricultural country, without enterprise, without trade, without wealth, without colonies. But England, though poor, was ambitious. Her leading men wished her to become a World-Power. Sir Walter Raleigh wrote: 'Whosoever commands the sea commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself,' and Lord Bacon declared 'The rule of the sea is the epitome of monarchy,' and advised this country to conquer the wealth and the colonies of Spain because Spain's power was no longer sufficient to defend her vast and wealthy possessions. Following the advice of her greatest statesmen, England made war upon Spain, not for political or religious reasons but because Spain owned the wealth of the New World. Spain declined and Holland became by war and by work heir to the larger part of Spain's wealth. Then England transferred her hostility from Spain to Holland. Attacked by England, who was later on joined by France, the Netherlands declined, England and France fell to fighting over the great Dutch inheritance, and war had to decide whether the New World was to become French or English. Thus by three centuries of war, firstly against Spain, then against Holland, and lastly against France, was the British Empire won, and the struggle for empire ended only in 1815 when at last Great Britain had vanquished all her European rivals. British colonial and commercial supremacy is barely a century old.

The rise of the British World-Empire has been similar to that of all other States and Empires, and only those who are ignorant of history and of the great physiological and historical laws which rule the world can condemn the triumphant progress of the Anglo-Saxon race. This world is not a world of ease and peace, but a world of strife and war. Nature is ruled by the law of the struggle for existence and of the survival of the fittest and the strongest. States, like trees and animals, are engaged in a never-ending struggle for room, food, light, and air, and that struggle is a blessing in disguise, for it is the cause of all

progress. Had it not been for that struggle, the world would still be a wilderness inhabited by its aboriginal savages.

The abolition of war would be a misfortune to mankind. It would lead not to the survival of the fittest and strongest, but to the survival of the sluggard and the unfit, and therefore to the degeneration of the human race. However, there is no likelihood that universal peace will be established. As long as human nature remains what it is, as long as self-interest, not benevolence, is the predominant motive in men and in States, those nations which are ambitious and strong will seize the possessions of those which are rich and weak. Thus Nature constantly rejuvenates the world and compels States to increase in civilisation and strength by the same means by which she compels individuals to cultivate both mind and body, and those States which disregard the supreme law of Nature and of history disappear.

All States and Empires are founded upon power. By the exercise of power families have grown into tribes, tribes into States, and States into empires. The word 'Power' happily expresses the essence of the State, for the State is not only founded upon power but *is* power. Power is the only valid title by which a nation holds its possessions, and only by power can it retain them. That is the law of Nature and the law of history. The fate of nations depends therefore chiefly on their strength and on their fitness for facing the universal struggle for existence, and wars will hardly be abolished by international agreement unless the universal law of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest and strongest be previously abrogated. It is true that the prophet tells us 'They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more'; but he shrewdly adds that that happy event will come to pass only 'in the last days,' and these are not yet.

In Lord Bacon's words, 'For Empire and greatness it importeth most that a nation do profess arms as their principal honour, study, and occupation.' The great commercial world-empires of the past from Phœnicia to the Dutch world-empire have been conquered and have declined and decayed because they neglected cultivating their strength and providing in time for their defence. May not the loosely jointed and ill-organised British Empire have a fate similar to that of its great predecessors, and may we not, if we recognise that possibility in time, take in time the necessary steps to guard ourselves against such a calamity?

The maintenance of naval supremacy is an absolute necessity for the defence of the British Empire, for it can hardly be doubted that the disappearance of our naval supremacy would inevitably, and very speedily, be followed by the peaceful dissolution or by the violent break-up of the Empire. As soon as the connexion between the various parts of the Empire can be severed at will by a Power

supreme on the sea, the British Empire exists only by permission of that Power. Inter-imperial trade in peace would be at the mercy of that nation which rules the sea, and which conceivably might interfere with the free flow of inter-imperial trade with the object of benefiting its own citizens. A State supreme on the sea might, therefore, drain the British Empire of its wealth by navigation laws and wanton fiscal interference against which diplomatic protests might prove unavailing. If the British Empire should be engaged in war with a third Power, concerted action and mutual assistance would become impossible for the members of the Empire except by the permission of the supreme naval Power, and our possessions would inevitably, one by one, fall to the nation supreme on the sea, which alone would be able, economically and militarily, to protect them, and which would be able to acquire them at its leisure either by war or by economic or diplomatic pressure. With the disappearance of British naval supremacy the British Empire would exist merely on sufferance, and Great Britain could keep only that portion of her oversea trade and those of her colonies which the supreme naval Power would allow her to retain. Like Spain and Portugal, Great Britain would be deprived of her most valuable possessions and be left only with those which would not be worth the taking. Therefore the end of British naval supremacy would certainly mean the end of the British Empire. Hence the most important question arises, Will Great Britain be able to continue maintaining her naval supremacy?

Our naval policy is at present based upon the two-Power standard. Great Britain endeavours to maintain a fleet equal in strength to the combined strength of the fleets possessed by the two second strongest naval Powers, rightly considering that these might possibly ally themselves against her. Up to a few years ago France and Russia, whose policy then was hostile to this country, were the two second strongest naval Powers. Lately the danger of a Franco-Russian attack on this country has diminished, but at the same time the United States and Germany have come forward and have become competitors with this country for naval supremacy.

Two questions ought now to be considered: (1) Ought Great Britain to maintain a fleet strong enough to meet the combined fleets of the United States and Germany? (2) Is Great Britain able to maintain the two-Power standard against the United States and Germany?

In order to solve these two questions we must first of all consider our relations with the United States and Germany and the probable development of these relations.

The United States and Germany were formerly Land Powers, one might almost say Inland Powers. Their citizens were chiefly occupied in agriculture, and they exchanged their surplus of wheat,

meat, timber, and other raw produce against British manufactures. In the course of the last two or three decades the policy of Protection has changed the economic aspect, and with the economic aspect the political character, of both these countries, and has converted our best customers into our most active and most dangerous competitors. The United States and Germany not only supply their home markets with the productions of their flourishing industries, virtually excluding our manufactures, but not our raw products, from them, but they also export huge quantities of manufactured goods to all countries, and they have deliberately embarked upon a policy of maritime expansion and colonisation with the object of securing the control of the raw materials used by their industries, and of obtaining an adequate outlet for their surplus manufactures. In France and Russia we used to have competitors who were actuated mainly by political ambition, by the desire of colouring the map. In the United States and Germany we have now competitors for colonies and empire who are actuated by a far more powerful and therefore far more dangerous motive—economic necessity.

Let us consider separately the relation of Great Britain and the British Empire with the United States and with Germany.

Englishmen and Americans are of the same stock, and, from the sentimental point of view, they are friends, but economically, and therefore to some extent politically as well, they are rivals. During many years the United States have steadfastly and unflinchingly striven to become a great industrial nation, and they have succeeded, and now they are striving with the greatest energy and determination to become a great maritime and colonial nation as well. The largest portion of the American exports and imports is at present carried in British ships, but powerful interests in America are striving to eliminate the British middleman, and to transfer this profitable branch of our carrying trade to American hands by means of large subsidies paid under a Shipping Bill which has been discussed in Congress and the Senate, and which ought soon to become law. However, America means not only to reserve the American shipping trade to American citizens by protective measures similar in character and effect to those by which she has created her manufacturing industries and has reserved to her citizens her home market, but she also endeavours to take away from us the most profitable branch of our foreign trade, our trade with the East. The Panama Canal is designed to strike a terrible blow at our Eastern trade. As the great industrial centres of America are situated on or near the East Coast where coal and iron abound, they are separated from Asia by a longer sea distance than that which separates Great Britain from Asia. Therefore Great Britain is at present the halfway house and the carrier for the seaborne trade between the United States and the East. When the Panama Canal is finished, the American East Coast will no

longer be farther away from Asia than Great Britain, but Great Britain will be farther away from Asia than the American East Coast, and then the Suez Canal route, which possesses many great disadvantages, may cease to be the world's high road of commerce between the East and the West. America may therefore become the natural halfway house and the carrier for the water-borne goods exchanged between the East and the West, and, unless we take in time vigorous counter-measures, in self-defence, we may lose to the United States not only the Chinese and Japanese markets but our Indian market as well. If, later on, America should favour American trade at the Panama Canal by differential tolls or by refunding tolls—and such a step seems by no means impossible notwithstanding paper undertakings to the contrary—the most valuable part of our shipping trade and our great Eastern markets may suddenly be taken away from Great Britain and be transferred bodily to the United States.

Desiring to be self-supporting and self-sufficing, and considering their territories too narrow, the United States have become an imperial and a colonising nation. They have conquered the colonies of Spain, they have clearly shown their desire to extend their colonial empire in various directions, they are building an enormous fleet, and we cannot too often ask ourselves 'What is the American navy for?'

Although Anglo-American relations are most cordial, the vigorous expansionist policy followed by the United States is not without danger to the British Empire, because 'business is business,' and because the most desirable colonies happen to be in British hands. We must also not forget that not so very long ago President Cleveland was ready to use our paltry differences with Venezuela as a pretext for war with Great Britain in order to withdraw public attention from his political mistakes, and that a war with Great Britain would then have been very popular in America. The American people are an easily excitable people in whose mind there is a strong strain of aggressiveness. Besides, some of our diplomatic dealings with the United States—I refrain from quoting painful examples—should have convinced us that the Government of the United States follows not a sentimental but a business policy, that it promotes the interests of its citizens without overmuch regard to abstract virtue and to the feelings of other nations, and that it relies as much upon power for achieving its aims as do the military States of Europe. Therefore we cannot take it for granted that the United States will always be friendly to this country, and we cannot contemplate with indifference a desire on their part to acquire the rule of the sea unless we are determined to commit political suicide. Only the strong are respected in international politics. Canada, our West Indian islands, and our harbours throughout the world, are a standing temptation to the sense of acquisitiveness which is at least as strongly developed in American statesmen and business men as it is in our own. The stronger we are,

the more cordial will be our relations with America. Our weakness might prove an irresistible temptation to American politicians anxious for renown or for popularity to increase the wealth and strength of their country at the cost of the British Empire.

The foregoing should make it clear that Great Britain must maintain her naval supremacy against the United States if she wishes to preserve the Empire.

Let us now look into Anglo-German relations and their probable development.

Germany, like the United States, used to be a poor agricultural country and a customer of Great Britain for her manufactured goods. In 1879 Bismarck introduced the policy of Protection. Since then the industries and the wealth of Germany have so marvellously increased that she has become our most dangerous industrial competitor in all our markets including our home market. Not satisfied with having become the greatest industrial nation, though not the greatest exporting nation, in Europe, Germany desires to become a great maritime and colonial empire as well, because she wishes to buy the raw products she requires in her own possessions and to have secure outlets oversea for her surplus manufactures, but chiefly because she requires outlets in the temperate zone for her rapidly growing population, which increases every year by about 900,000 whilst ours increases only by some 300,000.

In order to be able to become a great maritime and colonial state Germany requires in the first place a sufficiency of well-situated commercial and naval harbours. Hamburg, her only great harbour, is not very favourably situated, for nearly all the great industrial centres of Germany lie on or near the Rhine, which is the great high road of German trade, because coal and iron abound in its vicinity. Therefore the greatest German harbours are not Hamburg and Bremen, but the harbours at the mouths of the Rhine, Antwerp and Rotterdam, and it is not unnatural that Germany desires to obtain the control of these harbours. Modern Germany, Prusso-Germany, is the heir of the old German Empire, of which the Netherlands formed as much a part as did Alsace-Lorraine, and Germany has as strong an historical claim on the former as that which, in 1870, she successfully asserted with regard to the latter. From the point of view of every thinking and patriotic German it is absurd that the mouths of the principal German river should be in the hands of a nation of the fourth rank which originally formed a part of Germany, and which speaks a Low-German dialect. From the point of view of every German business man it seems intolerable that the Netherlands should be allowed to make a profit, one might almost say to levy tribute, on every article exported from, and imported into, the principal manufacturing districts of Germany *via* the Rhine; that the Netherlands should become wealthy by Germany's work. From

the German point of view the fact that Holland and Germany are two separate States is an anachronism.

Germany has two war harbours—Wilhelmshafen, on the North Sea, and Kiel, on the Baltic. The former is a narrow artificially dug-out port which is totally insufficient for Germany's requirements. The latter is a large port which has the equally great disadvantage that it can be reached only by making the lengthy and very dangerous *détour* round Denmark, or by using the Baltic North Sea Canal, which might easily become blocked in war time either through accident or through hostile action. Besides it is not deep enough for the huge ships which Germany is building, and 10,000,000*l.* will be required for widening and deepening it. Germany is in the absurd position that she is building an enormous fleet without possessing adequate harbours for her ships, and she is therefore compelled by necessity either to acquire the great harbours of the Netherlands or to give up her claims to oversea expansion. Consequently it seems absolutely certain that Germany will earlier or later make a most determined attempt to make Rotterdam and Antwerp German ports, and from her point of view she is quite justified in doing so.

Germany must be able industrially and politically to expand; she must become a great maritime and colonial Power or she will, for lack of space, lose her rank as a Great Power. The Emperor's watchword, 'Germany's future lies upon the water,' has become the watchword and the rallying cry of the German nation, and as Great Britain rules the sea, and possesses practically all the most desirable colonies situated in the temperate zone, Germany must be able to overcome this country in order to carry out her aims. Therefore the preamble to the great German Navy Bill of 1900, by which about 200,000,000*l.* were voted for naval purposes, plainly stated 'Germany must have a fleet of such strength that a war against the mightiest naval Power would involve risks threatening the supremacy of that Power.' Through that document Germany proclaimed to the world her determination to challenge the naval supremacy of this country. By the supplementary Navy Bill of 1906 an additional sum of about 50,000,000*l.* was voted for naval purposes, and in a few years some twenty German ships of about 20,000 tons, each of which is to be larger and stronger than our own *Dreadnought*, will be built, and the new Reichstag, which contains an expansionist majority, may be expected to vote further huge sums for naval purposes. Germany is challenging in earnest the naval supremacy of Great Britain.

Germany may enter upon her career of active expansion either by a naval attack upon this country, or by an attempt at securing an adequate base for her oversea operations by acquiring in some form or other the harbours of the Netherlands. Circumstances will determine whether she will follow the former or the latter course, but both eventualities should carefully be considered.

As Germany is not yet strong enough on the sea to attack this country alone, she has naturally tried to gain partners in a possible enterprise against Great Britain. France would have been a very useful ally to Germany because she has a strong fleet and because an invasion of this country could more easily be effected from the French than from the German harbours. Russia's support would have been very valuable because a joint Russo-German expedition might threaten India. Through the far-seeing diplomacy of King Edward, France and Russia have abandoned their policy favouring Germany's aims, upon which they had embarked through Bismarck's skill and the clumsiness of our own amateur statesmen.

Last, but not least, America could threaten Canada and could therefore serve as a valuable counterpoise against this country. To this consideration the 'traditional' friendship of Prussian statesmen for America, from Frederick the Great, who supported the revolted colonies against the Motherland, to Bismarck, was due, and the gift of a monument of Frederick the Great, which William the Second made to the United States, was full of significant meaning. So far German diplomacy has been too crude and too obvious, and has therefore failed in securing America's support in her expansionist policy. However, it seems by no means impossible that, with more skilful statesmen in Berlin and less skilful ones in Washington, German diplomacy may succeed in securing the support of the United States for her policy of expansion.

The fact that, notwithstanding the breakdown of Russia and the peaceful attitude of France, Germany is rapidly increasing and strengthening her army seems to indicate that she contemplates using her land forces for expansion in Europe, and it seems not unlikely that she will make the acquisition of the Netherlands the first step in her programme. The Netherlands would make Germany paramount on the Continent of Europe and immensely strengthen her power of aggression against Great Britain, which could comparatively easily be invaded from the numerous harbours on the mouths of the Rhine. If Germany should acquire the Netherlands, a situation would be created which would be as threatening to all European nations, and especially to this country, as was the situation created by Napoleon I.

The foregoing analysis of the political situation clearly proves that Great Britain, if she wishes to preserve the Empire, is compelled to maintain the two-Power standard against the United States and Germany, although she is at present not threatened by either country, because the natural development of Germany and of the United States will probably cause them to encroach upon the British Empire unless the British Empire is strong enough at sea to forbid such encroachment. Therefore we must now consider the question: will Great Britain be able to maintain her naval supremacy against the combined fleets of the United States and Germany?

Great Britain has no longer the monopoly of maritime ability. The Germans and Americans have proved themselves able seamen and excellent shipbuilders. The longest national purse can build the strongest national fleet. Therefore the question whether Great Britain will be able to maintain the two-Power standard against the United States and Germany is mainly a financial one.

Unfortunately it seems clear that Great Britain will financially not be able to maintain her naval supremacy against the United States and Germany, and it must even be doubted whether Great Britain will be able to continue for long outbuilding the German Navy, notwithstanding all official and semi-official declarations to the effect that for every ship laid down by Germany Great Britain will lay down two ships. It is generally known that the United States are richer than Great Britain, but it is not generally known that Germany also is apparently richer than is this country; that in a financial duel for naval pre-eminence Germany may prove stronger than this country. Great Britain has some 40,000,000 inhabitants, Germany has some 60,000,000 inhabitants, and as the German workers are fully employed whilst a very heavy percentage of British workers is always out of employment, we may say that in productive man-power Great Britain and Germany stand not in the relation of 4 to 6, but approximately in the relation of 4 to 7. Besides, all the German industries, including agriculture, are exceedingly flourishing, as may be seen from the fact that, notwithstanding the immense yearly increase of her population, Germany suffers chronically from a dearth of workers, so that immigration into Germany is greater than emigration from Germany, whilst most British industries are stagnant or decaying, as may be seen by the fact that, notwithstanding a yearly emigration of from 200,000 to 300,000 people, the British labour market remains congested, and that Great Britain suffers continually, and very acutely, from a dearth of work and consequent unemployment and pauperism. In view of this state of affairs, we cannot wonder that, if we compare the British and German income-tax statistics, we find that the income of the German classes has, during the last fifteen years, increased five times faster than that of the British classes, and that, if we compare British and German savings-banks statistics, we find that the savings of the German masses have, during the last six years, increased ten times faster than those of the British masses. These and many other facts, which it would lead too far to mention in this space, make it clear that Germany is considerably richer than is Great Britain, and that her wealth is rapidly growing whilst ours remains comparatively stationary, and if we look at the other side of the account we find that the German citizens are not only richer but are also less heavily taxed than are the British citizens. For every 1*l.* paid in the form of income tax by the average German taxpayer, the average British taxpayer has to pay 2*l.*, and for every 1*l.* paid by

the average German householder in local taxation the average British householder has to pay 2*l.* 10*s.* The foregoing facts indicate that Germany is financially able to outbuild the British fleet, and the result of the recent Reichstag election seems to show that the nation has also the ambition and the will to do so.

The wealth of a nation depends in the first instance, not upon the quantity of commodities exported and imported, and upon the quantity of its possessions of printed paper in the shape of stocks and shares, but upon the number of its inhabitants engaged in active production. The United States have some 80,000,000 inhabitants, Germany has some 60,000,000 inhabitants, Great Britain has some 40,000,000 inhabitants. The German population increases three times faster than the British population, the American population increases five times faster than the British population, and the population of Germany and of the United States combined increases eight times faster than the British population. In man-power, which after all is a more important economic factor than machine-power, although it is hardly mentioned in the textbooks of political economy, Germany and the United States are so far superior to Great Britain, and the disproportion between the man-power possessed by Great Britain and her two greatest rivals is increasing to our disadvantage with such alarming rapidity, that it is evident that Great Britain cannot much longer maintain her naval supremacy, because she will lack the necessary financial means, and, having lost her naval supremacy, she will certainly be deserted by her present allies.

The foregoing remarks make it clear that the British Empire can be preserved only if the supremacy of the British Navy be maintained against both the United States and Germany, but they make it equally clear that Great Britain will soon financially be unable to continue maintaining her naval supremacy not only against the two second strongest naval Powers, but even against Germany alone. As the burden which rests upon the British producer can hardly be greatly increased, it seems almost certain that within ten, or at the utmost within twenty, years, Great Britain will have sunk either to the second or to the third rank among naval Powers, and that the British Empire will then be a thing of the past.

The position of the Empire is evidently a most critical, though it is not yet a desperate, one. Happily, the possession of the rule of the sea gives us several years' breathing time, and enables us to provide against the very great dangers of the future. Although Great Britain, standing alone, cannot possibly much longer preserve her naval supremacy, the United British Empire can certainly maintain it. The latent resources of the British Empire are greater than are the latent resources of the United States and Germany combined. Although the British Empire cannot possibly be defended by Great Britain alone against the two second strongest naval Powers, it can

certainly, as far as one can see into the future, be defended practically for all time by a navy which is paid for by an Imperial Exchequer.

Necessity, not parliamentary resolutions and after-dinner orations, creates States and Empires. The necessity of making the British Empire, which is at present merely a geographical expression, a political reality has now arrived, and that necessity is most urgent. The British Empire can be preserved only if the Governments of Great Britain and the Colonies are willing to place Imperial above local interests. The British Colonies are naturally averse from paying into the British national exchequer large contributions for Imperial defence, over the spending of which they have not the slightest control, which are to be used towards the maintenance of a navy which is exclusively directed by a British Admiralty. Therefore, an Imperial defence based upon Imperial means can be organised only if the nucleus of an Imperial Cabinet, with an Imperial Navy Board, an Imperial Exchequer, and an Imperial Senate, representing the whole Empire, be created.

The British Empire has grown out of its old clothes. We can no longer leave the organisation of the Empire in a state of chaos, and follow a happy-go-lucky hand-to-mouth policy without any definite aim, making Imperial interests subordinate to the British party-political requirements of the moment, but we must follow a far-seeing policy of deliberate and constructive Imperialism. We must organically connect our vast colonies and possessions with the Motherland, and planfully rear a solid Imperial edifice. We must, before all, protect the magnificent undeveloped or partly developed Imperial domain for future generations, by organising the defence of the Empire on an Imperial basis. We must, under the protection of a supreme fleet, people our colonies as rapidly as possible, and thereby strengthen them both militarily and economically. We must re-create the British industries which our blind faith in the wisdom of certain economic theories and our consequent policy of deliberate neglect have caused to decay, so that Germany, notwithstanding her poor natural resources and the burden of militarism, is now actually richer than Great Britain, and can afford to challenge our maritime supremacy.

The question of the unification of the Empire by the creation of a supreme Imperial Government representative of the whole Empire as well as the question of the protection of the national resources and the home industries of Great Britain by suitable State action, fiscal or otherwise, is not a party question, but is the most important national question. It is in the first instance a question of military defence, and it is a question upon which depends the life or death of Great Britain and of the British Empire. The latent resources of Great Britain and her Colonies are practically boundless, but they have been insufficiently developed, and these latent resources must be developed to the utmost and fully utilised for the preservation of

our possessions, of our position in the world, of our peace, of our prosperity, and of our civilisation. This is the most urgent political problem of the moment. Our policy should therefore be to develop our latent resources with the greatest vigour, not in accordance with the dictates of abstract scientific theory, but in accordance with the dictates of common sense, and with the universal practical experience of mankind.

I think it is clear that Great Britain cannot much longer defend the Empire single-handed. Therefore the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and of the Colonies must seriously think of creating without delay an Imperial force for the defence of the Empire, directed by an Imperial Cabinet and financed by Imperial means. The action of the present Colonial Conference may determine the fate of Great Britain and of the Empire, for the next ten or twenty years should decide whether the British Empire will stand or fall.

J. Ellis Barker.

SOUTH AFRICAN LOYALTY

A RECENT visit to South Africa, in the course of which I renewed acquaintance with men of different shades of opinion and of both the white races, is my excuse for this article. The observations of a traveller sometimes have a value which is lacking to more settled resident opinion.

The result of the first general election in the Transvaal, and the appointment of General Botha, five years ago our enemy, to the position of Prime Minister, compel popular attention once more to the country. What is to be the result?

At home the Liberal party frankly disapproved of the war. Is the effect of their policy, and of the Constitutions which they have granted to the Transvaal and have promised to the Orange River Colony, to set the clock back and to leave the position of Boers and British as before the struggle?

General Botha has told us that he has come to the Colonial Conference to say that Briton and Boer are alike loyal to the British flag. But there are many Englishmen who are not satisfied, hoping that it may be true, but suspicious that it is too good to deserve credence. It is difficult to see the whole picture in its true perspective. The resident of South Africa emerging from the turmoil of a general election, and wearing still the spectacles of his party, is at as great a disadvantage in measuring its true proportions as the British Islander, who sees dimly from a distance through the unequally focussed binoculars of antagonistic party newspapers at home. Nor can it be realised in all its significance without some regard to history. We must pursue that will-of-the-wisp—the ideal of South African independence. We must discover whether the ideal still exists, and whether it is in accord with the material interests of the present population. Only then shall we see plain.

I shall first endeavour to show that the ideal of South African independence arose not in the Cape Colony, nor in the Orange Free State, but in the Transvaal; that in the Transvaal it owed its influence entirely to the energy of one man, Paul Kruger; and that it vanished with his death. I shall assume that a dead ideal cannot be revived if it is contrary to the material interests of the public, and I shall

endeavour to show that such is the case in South Africa. Finally, I shall try to point out that the original cause of South African disaffection was not the antagonism of Dutch and British, but the interference of the Imperial Government in the native question; and that to-day the fate of South African loyalty depends on the policy of the British people at home with regard to that question.

For a hundred years the Union Jack has waved at Cape Town, and for a hundred years the British and Dutch have lived side by side in the Colony distinct in race and language.

Rightly or wrongly, it has never been British policy to suppress the language of subject populations. Nothing is more striking than a comparison between the French populations of Lower Canada and Louisiana. The Americans passed no North America Act, and signed no terms of Vereeniging; yet the rising generation of Louisiana is as American as President Roosevelt, while the inhabitant of Quebec cannot understand the King's English. Nevertheless, the French Canadian remains a loyal subject of his Majesty, and his material interests bind him to the British Empire as firmly as do those of the Creole to the American Republic.

Similarly in Cape Colony the interests of the Dutch have bound them to the British connection. There were 'rebels' in Cape Colony during the recent war, just as there were 'rebels' in Lower Canada during Riel's rebellion. Such a state of things is natural where ties of blood conflict with ties of government, but on the whole the Dutch of the Colony and their administration remained loyal. It is true that the British armies were quartered in their territory, but it is also true that apparently victorious Boers were on their frontiers, and that they did not rise as a people. To analyse the sentiments which go to make up loyalty is as futile as to analyse those which go to make up love: we can but judge by results and say that the Dutch, in spite of the ties of relationship with the Boers, as a people were loyal.

Since the Colony received self-government Dutch and British administrations have succeeded one another, and we have had the spectacle of a great Englishman leading the Dutch party, and of Mr. Hofmeyer, the most influential of the Dutch, attending in an Imperial spirit the Jubilee Colonial Conference.

Other evidence could be produced, but the history of the Colony during the last fifty years suffices to justify the statement that the two peoples, divided by language and race, are willing to dwell together in unity.

The Transvaal owes its foundation to the native question.

The original idea of the Voortrekkers which led them to quit the Colony was not the ideal of an Afrikander nation. The leader of the emigrants, Piet Retief, in a letter to the Governor in 1834 thus explains the Great Trek. 'It was caused,' he says, 'by the losses to which the farmers had been subjected by the emancipation of their slaves.'

and he further complains of the absence of laws to control vagrancy (Native Pass laws) and of the inadequate protection against the Kaffirs, by whom hundreds of their farms were laid waste.

So, too, Pretorius, the leader of the Natal Boers, after the refusal of the Governor, Sir H. Pottinger, to meet him or consider grievances, thus recounts his story to Sir Harry Smith in 1848 :

> Our friend Colonel Smith, we were living quietly under a Government which we were attached to, our loyalty has been suspected, Kaffirs have been located on our lands and intermixed with us. These are the causes which have led us to abandon our houses. We are seeking a home in the wilderness.

In the final convention with the Transvaal Boers in 1854, the native question again appears to the front. On the British side it is stipulated that there shall be no slavery, on the Boer side Pretorius exacts that there shall be no interference by the British with the natives. There was no national ideal present. The instrument merely described the Transvaalers as 'the emigrant farmers beyond the Vaal.'

As soon, however, as Pretorius had settled matters with the British and was relieved from immediate danger from the blacks, he found his Transvaalers divided into four communities. His efforts united them under one flag, the 'Vierkleur.' From that time forward there was a small but determined knot of men, of whom the principal was Paul Kruger, who ardently worked for South African independence.

Their first action in 1857 was to endeavour to force the Boers between the Orange and Vaal rivers to join their federation. But the Free Staters were not Voortrekkers nursing grievances against the British : they were merely farmers who had crossed the Orange to find better pasture. Their independence had been forced on them by the Imperial Government, who had refused to be responsible for them beyond the river, and their first official declaration on that occasion contains an affectionate reference to Queen Victoria. They had no sympathy with the Transvaal. They resisted alike the commandos of Kruger and the diplomacy of Pretorius, and in the next year, in 1858, we find them petitioning the Imperial Government to annex them to the Cape Colony. Unfortunately, the Secretary of State refused their request. The Free Staters, however, remained resolutely friends of the British. When they had difficulties with the Basutos, the High Commissioner was called in to arbitrate. When the British Government took the newly discovered mines of Kimberley from them, President Brand accepted pecuniary compensation, and he steadily refused the overtures of Kruger to make even a defensive alliance with the South African Republic. It was only after the Jameson Raid that the Free Staters pledged themselves to stand by their cousins beyond the Vaal.

The ideal of South African independence, then, was confined to the Transvaal, and even there it was the policy of a very small

section. It was carried on by Mr. Burgers, who succeeded Pretorius as President. He endeavoured to annex Delagoa Bay as an outlet to Europe, and to join it by railway with Pretoria; but at this time the native chief, Sekukuni, rose against the Boers and defeated them. The Transvaal was thrown on its beam ends, the burghers refused either to go on commando against the blacks or to pay taxes, and the credit of the State sank until a one-pound note was worth a shilling. Burgers resigned saying he would sooner be a policeman under a strong Government than the President of such a State. To prevent anarchy the British Government was forced to take action. In 1877 Sir Theophilus Shepstone proceeded to the Transvaal and annexed it with no larger army than an escort of twenty-five Natal Mounted Police. Even these were unnecessary. His horses were taken out of his carriage and he was dragged in triumph through the streets of Pretoria.

Dr. Jorrissen, a Hollander lieutenant of Kruger, writing in 1876, says: 'There was no such thing as patriotism in the Transvaal. Each Boer lived on his own farm free from any relations with the Government.' The correspondent of the Cape paper *Ons Land* estimated that 96 per cent. of the population were in favour of annexation.

Even President Burgers, in his parting address, advised that the people should make the best terms they could and federate with the Cape; then, he said, 'from the Cape to the Zambesi there would be one great people; yes, there was something grand in that—even grander than in their idea of a republic.'

The ideal of South African independence seemed to have vanished in smoke, and but for one man it would have done so. That man was Paul Kruger. The Boers are an easy people to lead; a large proportion are illiterate. Provided they are not taxed or called out on commando they are generally willing to obey in politics the orders of their recognised chiefs. Mr. Kruger, assisted by his subsequent opponent, Mr. Joubert, proceeded to organise 'the People's Committee' to protest against annexation. The danger from the blacks was gone. The Imperial Government delayed to grant the self-government which Sir T. Shepstone had promised. The delay was due, firstly, to the resignation of Lord Carnarvon, and, secondly, to the general election and change of Government of 1880; but it was represented in South Africa as a broken pledge. The Liberal party at home had in opposition protested against the annexation. Their advent to power led the Boers to expect retrocession. When Mr. Gladstone stated that they could not relinquish the Transvaal, war broke out. The British were caught unprepared, and the campaign ended in the disastrous defeat at Majuba and the still more disastrous retrocession of the Transvaal.

Once more the ideal of an independent South Africa appeared with strength renewed from the victory of the Boer arms.

Under the long presidency of Kruger the more educated of the

burghers studied the history of the American rebellion and dreamed of a South African United States; but while they indulged in these dreams they must have been made painfully aware that their leader's methods were not those of a George Washington. President Kruger's policy was to maintain his popularity with the illiterate back-veldt Boers by remitting all direct taxation and to depend for his revenue on the sale of concessions to foreigners. The Transvaal soon swarmed with these foreigners, who proved the value of their concessions by reducing the country to bankruptcy. The discovery of the Rand and the arrival of the gold-miners saved the situation. The output of gold restored the credit of the State, but it ultimately destroyed the Kruger *régime*. The President treated the newcomers as enemies, while he depended upon them for revenue. The result of such policy was inevitable. Mr. Joubert, who had worked with Kruger on the 'People's Committee,' saw it, and now appeared as his opponent. When in 1892 the two men stood against one another for the presidency, it is commonly believed that Joubert received the most votes, but that Kruger faked his own election. It is certain that the former had the support of the large majority of the educated burghers. Kruger won, the Raid followed, throwing the Free State into the arms of the Transvaal, and then came the war.

The ideal of South African Independence may have been conceived by Pretorius when he hoisted the Vierkleur in the Transvaal, but its growth and strength were due to the strong personality of Paul Kruger. It appeared at the outset of his career, it was revived by him when apparently extinct in 1880, and it only vanished at the end of his life. Its home was the Transvaal. It never flourished at the Cape and it was only after the Jameson Raid that it received the favour of the Free State. To discover whether it can again revive we must look in the Transvaal, the land of its birth.

With the flight of Kruger his policy and his party were alike discredited. Joubert was dead. The war brought new men to the front. The new leaders have had opportunity to learn, and reason to regret, the errors of the Kruger calculations. The increase of the Imperial spirit in British public opinion since 1880, the strength of the British naval and military forces, the insincerity or impotence of European nations in their professed desire to help the Boers, the unwillingness of the Cape Dutch to enter upon a struggle with the British: these mistakes of the former President they understand, have suffered for, and resent. It may be true that England would be unwilling to embark again on such a struggle, but it is certain that the Boers have had too much of fighting to risk another war. If the ideal is to be revived, it must be by constitutional means. Will it so revive? What is the feeling of the Boer population?

They have given no evidence of a vindictive spirit. It must be remembered that their relations with the British have not been

those of French and Germans on either side of well-defined frontiers. The two races in the Transvaal were about equal in numbers; they have consequently had to learn to tolerate one another's existence. When the Boers saw eleven millions being spent on their repatriation, their cries for compensation for war losses waxed louder and louder. Their protests against the administration swelled in proportion as they received consideration, but such protests need not be taken any more seriously than those of a farmer who is endeavouring to sell his cow for more than its value.

Their reception of Mr. Chamberlain immediately after the war was courteous, and even friendly. If they cherished feelings of revenge, it is inconceivable that as a nation they could have concealed them. No 'slimness' could possibly account for such an attitude. On the contrary, they liked the man and they showed that they did.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the Transvaal Boers are the least educated of the Dutch, and therefore the easiest to lead. They will stick to their party like the old Tory squire of the eighteenth century, and therefore their leaders have to be reckoned with.

Are these leaders biding their time to revive the old ideal?

Their action under the administration of Lord Milner in refusing to join the Council was much criticised, but their explanation was a natural one: they could not lay aside feelings of resentment against those of their countrymen who had fought as National Scouts. Even without such explanation it would be perfectly intelligible that they should hesitate to compromise their position with their own people by making themselves responsible for an administration which they could not control. Their refusal was natural, their acceptance would have been wonderful.

That Het Volk have used strong language against the Crown Colony Government is true. At election times in all countries it is usual to attack the Government of the day, and inasmuch as the Progressives had identified themselves with the Milner administration, in which they shared as unofficial members, it almost followed that Het Volk should abuse it. To attack a Government is not treason, and we can find quite as violent denunciations of Lord Milner's administration in the speeches of the British Nationalist party as from the lips of Boer orators.

It is a fortunate circumstance that Het Volk should be in office and have to bear the responsibility for the administration. It must not, however, be supposed that, even if they had a wholly Dutch administration, their leaders could have anything like the power of the late Boer Government. They have above them a British High Commissioner, they have in front of them a coherent progressive minority, and they have all around them a rising Boer population whose education will soon be a very different one from that of the burghers of President Kruger. The new administration has already declared its

adherence to the national system of education inaugurated by Lord Milner, and has thereby shown its independence of the reactionary influence of the ministers of religion.

The power, therefore, of the Boer leaders must tend to diminish not only because, ceasing to be national heroes on the shelf, they have assumed the responsibilities of government, but because the education of the children will bring on the scene a rising generation who will have more independent views of their own interests.

It is a characteristic common to farmers to put material interests before high-flown enthusiasms. The Dutch are no exceptions to that rule. They are a clever people, but both in the Transvaal and in the Orange River Colony they are, as regards civilisation, quite a century behind the British. It is their interest to learn from the newcomers, and in nothing has this been brought home to them more forcibly than in the recent work of the departments of agriculture. The increase in the Boer population and the custom of dividing property equally between all the members of the farmer's family have led to a reduction in the size of farms. Their nomad practice, of driving their stock from the high to the middle veldt for winter feed, has necessarily come to an end owing to shortage of land. Better methods have to be resorted to, and the high-veldt farmer has to learn how he may feed his stock on his farm in winter, and is driven to cultivation. In this he has been greatly assisted by the new agricultural departments, and has largely availed himself of them.

Again, no greater compliment can be paid to these departments than the attitude of the Boers with regard to the diseases of red-water in cattle and scab in sheep. Conservative as they are, suspicious of change, and profoundly suspicious of the meddling of the Government in their farm management, they have been converted to co-operate with the officials in the destruction of diseased stock, and in the enforcement of the regulations promulgated by the departments. They have taken advantage of the stallions imported by the Government, and of the agronomic advice placed at their disposal. In this branch of administration the Boers speak warmly of the benefit of British rule, and indeed their leaders are sufficiently far-sighted to praise the experimental farms for tropical produce, such as tobacco and cotton, which have been established in the Zoutpansberg.

The following may be taken as fair evidence of their attitude, coming as it does from the brother of ex-President Steyn. Speaking at the Bloemfontein Farmers' Association last February, Mr. H. Steyn said:

> We want men to come to the Parliament that we can rely on to work for the farmers. Look at the Volksraad! Who was the farmer's greatest enemy? The farmer himself. Every time anything came forward for the good of the farmer it was put under the table. I can remember the time when it was proposed to have a veterinary surgeon. It was thrown out.

Continuing, Mr. Steyn said:

The present Government had done marvels for the country, and he was very glad to see their Governor was going to stop on. He [the Governor] was a farmer himself. Speaking of the veterinary department Mr. Steyn said that their experiments might be expensive, but they did much for the country, and as an example he instanced the importation and use of superior stallions and rams.—Extract from the *Bloemfontein Post* of February 4, 1907.

But the material interests of the Boers are not confined to agriculture. When, under President Kruger, the miners arrived to develop the Rand, the Transvaal State account was overdrawn at the bank and the credit of the country was exhausted. In two years the revenue increased by two millions. The Boers do not wish to drive away a goose which lays such golden eggs, nor is it likely that they will attempt to limit the output of gold. I do not believe that they are afraid of the political influence of the Rand, because they see the prospect of dissensions between capital and labour.

Again, the Dutch landowner and the British mining prospector have identical interests. The Boer welcomes the prospector on his farm because he hopes to sell it to him for much more than its agricultural value. A country reputed to be so full of minerals offers irresistible attractions to the emigrant Englishman, and the discovery of one successful coal or diamond mine brings as many men into the country as an expensive scheme of land settlement.

It is at least as probable that immigration will give an ultimate majority to the British as that the larger families of the Dutch will produce the contrary result.

But the chief interest of the farmer in the mines lies in the markets which he finds there. In the days of Pretorius, when they were nomads, the Boers lived on their cattle and required no markets. Even after their land settlement they lived on their farms with hardly any imports or exports. Owing to their custom, before mentioned, of dividing their property equally among their children—daughters as well as sons—properties have decreased in size. Smaller farms require closer farming, and closer farming necessitates markets such as only large towns can afford.

If, then, as it appears, the material interests of the Transvaalers increasingly require the co-operation of both races, the development of their own education will speedily lead them to recognise the fact, and no chimera of an independent flag will induce the one party to fall out seriously with the other.

The same conditions apply in the Orange River Colony, because the farmers there, too, supply the markets of the Rand and of Kimberley, and are equally anxious that the prospector should discover mineral wealth on their properties.

In Cape Colony the British and Dutch have no more reason to quarrel in the future than they have had in the past, nor is there any

ground for believing that throughout South Africa generally one of the two races will increase so rapidly as to enable it to oppress or disregard the other. The very fact that there are two races in competition with one another, while it weakens the Afrikander sentiment, tends to strengthen the hold of England upon both.

Everything, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the ideal of an independent South Africa will not revive; but ideals are necessary in politics, and it cannot be expected that the Dutch should feel for the British Empire the sentimental attraction of an Australian or of a New Zealander. The ideal of the immediate future appears to be the one foreseen by Mr. Burgers, when he said that the federation of all South Africa south of the Zambesi was grander than the idea of a Republic. Federation has been advocated by men of both races in Natal, in Cape Colony, and in the Transvaal. It is opposed by none; and therefore it must be under the British flag. Only its methods will be matters of contention, and these methods—whether of unification of peoples or of federation of States—as well as the choice of the site of a capital, are sufficient to occupy the minds of South Africans for some time to come. Meanwhile the British connection will be as much a matter of course as their breakfast.

The real danger to that connection does not arise from the Dutch. The seat of the danger is not at the Cape, but in London. It is the possible interference of the Imperial Government in the native question.

We have traced the history of the ideal of South African independence. That ideal was the result of the Great Trek, and the Great Trek was caused by the emancipation of the slaves by order of the Home Government. The days of slavery are past, but the native question remains. The natives of civilised South Africa are to-day the happiest and, for their requirements, the most prosperous members of the community. (A 'boy' in the mines earns in six months enough to keep him in affluence for twelve.) Yet so delicately balanced are the relations between whites and blacks, and so important is the question to the whole fabric of South African civilisation, that any ill-judged action on the part of the Home Government might raise such a storm as would unite every Briton and Boer to proclaim an independent republic.

Let the Englishman at home beware lest in his anxiety to benefit the black races he carry his sentiments too far, and thereby lose his power to have any influence in their affairs.

Dutch and British are alike anxious to take up their lives again, where they find themselves, side by side. The ideal of independence is gone; material interests obstruct its revival; but if, on a matter of vital importance, we, the people of the British Isles, are unwilling to trust the white population of South Africa, we cannot expect their loyalty.

MONK BRETTON.

IMPERIAL OUTPOSTS

WHATEVER doubts may exist as to the merits of any scheme of Army reform, it is unquestionable that within the Army itself, among both officers and men, there is to be witnessed the spontaneous growth of a spirit of individual self-reform as remarkable as it is reassuring. A movement so strong and so universal almost deserves the name of an upheaval. In all ranks there are signs and symptoms of a determination that on the soldiers' side, at any rate, nothing shall be wanting in the endeavour to raise the quality of the Army as a fighting force, whatever the supreme non-military public may choose to decide as to its quantity. Upon a subject which has recently been dealt with at some length in another arena [1] it would be superfluous here to dilate further in detail. But all friends of the British Army will be glad to note how effectively at the present time its enhanced professionalism is being assisted by the opportune publication of various books likely to prove valuable to the military student. Pre-eminent among these stands Mr. Fortescue's *History of the British Army*, of which the fourth volume has recently appeared, while another instalment is understood to be almost ready for the press. Within narrower lines, of course, but deserving to take place in the front rank of present-day military or quasi-military literature, is Colonel A. M. Murray's new book, felicitously named *Imperial Outposts*.[2] It is not a survey of the whole Empire, like Sir Charles Dilke's memorable *Greater Britain*, for it is concerned only indirectly with India, Australasia, and South Africa. Its aim is to give some account of that vast engirdling chain of military stations, extending round the world, which knits up the British dominion—the great highway of the Empire by which communication is kept up not only with our chief dependencies, but with Japan, whose alliance is the keystone of the English world-policy.

Realising the vital importance of safeguarding this principal line of communication—the sea portion of which includes the Mediter-

[1] 'Education in Relation to the Army' was the subject of a paper read and discussed at the Royal United Service Institution on the 20th of February.

[2] *Imperial Outposts from a Strategical and Commercial Aspect, with special Reference to the Japanese Alliance.* By Colonel A. M. Murray, R.A. London: John Murray, 1907.

ranean, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and the Straits of Malacca and Formosa—the author of this book last year made a personal inspection of the whole route from this country to Japan, visiting on the way Gibraltar, Malta, Aden, Colombo, Penang, Singapore, Hong-Kong, and Shanghai, and returning home by Canada. Concerning these 'Imperial posts' what Colonel Murray has to tell is of the highest importance in the interests of Imperial strategy and British trade. As he says, the British people are traders first and fighters afterwards, our colossal naval power being maintained as a means to securing our peaceful commercial expansion. This close interdependence of strategy and trade the author is careful to illustrate at all points. Such a book, based on the best information, moderate in length, written in an excellent style, and capitally illustrated with maps, plans, and photographs, should have a great vogue among Britons of every class who are mindful of the tremendous responsibilities of empire. But it is above all to the military profession—fired as it now is with fresh energies—that a book like this makes strong appeal. In the first place it throws welcome light on various points of Imperial strategy, supplying many details not easily obtainable—if at all—from ordinary sources, gathered at first-hand on the spot, and dealing with the very latest phases and most recent developments of the local conditions. In addition, Colonel Murray's five chapters on Japan, written immediately after the termination of the war, do much to satisfy the keen curiosity naturally felt in our own Army as to the causes which contributed to the recent astounding military successes of our Japanese allies. But, more than this, the author will earn the gratitude of many officers appointed to fill administrative political posts in newly acquired tracts of territory under the protection of the British flag. The due fulfilment of such a task, which in the process of the development and pacification of the British Empire often devolves on quite junior officers, must be materially aided by a knowledge in detail of the upgrowth of their Sovereign's oversea dominions. Over and over again it has been noted in the many dependencies of the Crown that the men whose work has yielded the quickest and richest harvest of order and prosperity are those who appreciate and can use to the highest advantage the racial characteristics of the peoples whose lives they are set to control.

At every spot which he visited the author's practised eye—aided, no doubt, by his official opportunities for becoming acquainted with the actualities of the position—have enabled him to draw conclusions of which it will be well worth his countrymen's while to take account. Even on the familiar topic of Gibraltar as the front-door of the Mediterranean, he re-states old facts well and has some new ones to add. The magnitude of Great Britain's commercial interests in the Mediterranean is perhaps not generally appreciated. One-third of our foreign trade comes along this inland sea, and it has recently become the

most important channel of wheat transportation to the British Isles. Its strategic importance is seen in the fact that through it lies the shortest way to India, Australia, and the Far East. To relax our hold on it would be 'to commit strategic suicide.' The British Mediterranean Fleet 'blocks the way from Europe to the Pacific and secures the safety of the Japanese alliance.'

Incidentally Colonel Murray expounds very clearly the latest views of the Admiralty on British naval strategy in European waters. When the new naval base for the east coast has been completed at Rosyth, in the Firth of Forth, or elsewhere, the new Home Fleet—now having its headquarters at the Nore—will be moved up thither, the Channel Fleet will substitute Dover for Portland as its harbour-base, while the Atlantic and Mediterranean Fleets will continue to be based, as now, on Gibraltar and Malta respectively. To Gibraltar, however, attaches the special distinction that it constitutes the pivot-base for the war distribution of our fleets as a whole. Malta, as base of the Mediterranean Fleet, is 'the most powerful maritime fortress in the world—stronger than Gibraltar or Hong-Kong in having no land frontier to protect,' and its harbour is being improved at great cost.

Colonel Murray's lucid exposition of the arguments for and against our abandonment of the Mediterranean route in time of war deserves to be studied. It has been urged that the Suez Canal would be blocked by a Power at war with England. But any such breach of the Convention of 1888 would untie England's hands and leave her free to take absolute possession of the Canal—the removal of a temporary block being no difficult matter, as experience has shown. As regards the risks to merchant ships, these are really greater by the longer Cape route, on which the coaling-stations are fewer and two great naval Powers possess strong naval bases. Naval opinion seems to be unanimous on the point, the author of the present volume

having the best reasons for stating that Prince Louis of Battenberg and Lord Charles Beresford have, since the completion of the Admiralty shipbuilding programme, both changed the views which they formerly held, and now believe not only in the necessity, but in the practicability ofprotecting British commerce along the Mediterranean route in time of war.

Referring to the Suez Canal, Colonel Murray decidedly negatives the idea of constructing a rival channel as offensive to France and wholly unnecessary, the congestion of traffic, present and future, being easily remediable by an extension of the process, already partially accomplished, of widening and deepening the existing Canal. For trade purposes the Suez Canal seems destined to defy all competitors—neither the Euphrates Valley railway nor the Panama Canal being likely to diminish its traffic.

In his suggestive chapter on Aden, 'the sentinel of the Red Sea,

with its outposts of Perim and Socotra, Colonel Murray shows conclusively that the place, though not a naval base, is a necessary and judiciously chosen link in our chain of communications. Two of his proposals deserve all possible attention. The first is that Aden be detached from its dependence on Bombay, erected into a colony, and granted powers of expansion similar to those possessed by Singapore, where Sir Frank Swettenham's vigorous rule shows what can be effected by the organisation of neighbouring friendly tribes of natives into a Protectorate and by the development of a lively trade with the interior. The second suggestion grows out of the first: it is designed for the relief of the unhappy 'British soldier doomed to long months of confinement in this dismal crater prison,' officers and men being alike forbidden to go beyond a native settlement just outside the gates. What is needed is a hill station connected by rail and wire with the sea-stronghold. At present the long since projected hill sanatorium finds little favour with the home authorities.

The momentous political issues which centre in the neighbourhood of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf are discussed with up-to-date knowledge and characteristic acumen. The respective interests of Italy and France in the Red Sea are recognised by England as in no way threatening her own position. It is rather amusing to read that the railway which the French are making from their port of Djibuti into the interior of Abyssinia is so anxiously desired by Menelik to reach his capital that he is making the necessary embankments at his own expense, and in a recent conversation referred with some impatience to the delay in completing 'my' railway. It is known at Aden that both the Home and Indian Governments are alive to the nature of the attacks which are being made on British commercial interests in the Gulf region, three-fourths of the total imports into Persia by this route coming from the United Kingdom and India. Already British trade has suffered during the last three years from the tariff forced on Persia by Russian pressure while our hands were full with the South African trouble.

But there is a still greater danger to British interests from the monopoly for railway construction granted to Russia in Persia and to Germany in Mesopotamia. If a Russian railway is made from Teheran to Bunder Abbas, and a German railway from Baghdad to Koweyt, the mastery of the Gulf will pass out of British hands. Neither of these two schemes can be carried out except with the consent of Great Britain, and a first condition of that assent shall be that the Gulf section of both railways should be constructed with British capital and worked under British administration. Great Britain has won her right to mastery in the Persian Gulf by long years of unselfish naval guardianship. At the cost of her people, and by the energy of her seamen, she has kept the door open to all the world, and that door must not now be closed against her. . . . If Koweyt and Bunder Abbas become the termini of German and Russian railways, a deathblow will be struck at our commercial supremacy in the Persian Gulf. England sends her warships to police the Gulf in order to protect her trade. If that trade goes, the fleet will go too. Then will

the flank of our great Imperial trade route to the East be exposed to attack, and we shall awake, as we did in South Africa, to an intolerable situation.

This grave warning is entirely endorsed by the detached judgment of Captain Mahan.

Of Ceylon, of its magnificent harbour, recently completed at a cost of nearly two millions and a half, and of its growing prosperity under a well-directed system of Crown Colony government whose wise thrift contrasts favourably with the wanton extravagance of democratic colonies, it is impossible here to treat in detail. From a military point of view greater interest attaches to Singapore, which is not only 'the gateway of the Pacific,' but the strategical pivot round which radiate the three divisions of the Eastern Fleet—the East Indian, the China, and the Australia squadrons, based respectively on Bombay, Hong-Kong, and Sydney. In time of war Singapore is the central rendezvous of all three squadrons for every purpose. Its *rôle* as a naval supply base, and the steps taken to develop its strategic resources and to utilise the advantages of its unique geographical position, are discussed by Colonel Murray with an intimacy of knowledge not inferior to that which he brings to bear on its commercial triumphs and on the possibilities to be anticipated from the realisation of the magnificent harbour scheme now in hand. Of Hong-Kong, 'the biggest port in the world,' which guards the north entrance of the China Sea as Singapore does the south, it is affirmed that the keynote to its prosperity is adherence to the policy of the open door. On the other hand, its strategic supremacy is threatened by America's acquisition of the Philippine Islands, Manila affording a fortified naval base on the flank of the British line of communications between Singapore and Hong-Kong.

A grave word of warning is uttered as to the 'yellow peril' that menaces the peace of Shanghai. British pioneers bore the whole burden of securing a footing in the Yangtze delta. But the British Government has persistently refused to afford the traders of Shanghai the protection obtained at Hong-Kong by the annexation of adjacent territory. Shanghai is a commercial settlement hampered by Chinese sovereignty mixed, but not combined, with foreign administration. It would be for the benefit of the whole community if Shanghai were a British possession. At least one-half of its trade is in British hands, and the original concession of 1842 was granted to British subjects. Unfortunately the British settlement has been internationalised, while two opportunities for annexation have been neglected. Meanwhile relations with the Chinese are strained, and there are not wanting grounds for fearing future mischief. Colonel Murray even writes: 'There are some who live at Shanghai in the same fools' paradise as English men and women lived in in India before the Mutiny; there are others who know they are resting on the edge of a volcano, but remain at the posts where their work and duty lie.'

As has been said, five chapters of this volume are devoted to a description of the Japanese, of their military and naval resources, of their national organisation for war, and of the personalities of their leading men. Of several leading generals an attractive account is given, and one of the most interesting illustrations is a portrait group-photograph of the military celebrities whose names became familiar to us during the war. The chapter on the Emperor and the principal statesmen by whom he is served completes a section of the book which, for Englishmen, throws a more interesting light on Japan than has before been available from any other source.

Two chapters are devoted to Canada, special attention being directed to the transcontinental lines of railway—existing, in making, or projected—with special reference to their strategic value to the Empire. The importance of the seaport Prince Rupert may be partly gauged from the fact that the through journey from London to Yokohama will be about two hundred miles shorter by the new Quebec-Prince Rupert route than by Quebec and Vancouver. Canadians point with legitimate pride to their gigantic railway undertakings, and to the shipbuilding which is to supplement them with trans-Pacific water-carriage. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cherished aim is that the Canadian producer should secure 'the four hundred million market of China and Japan,' and he looks forward to the great railways 'sending their trains to the west coast full of passengers, wheat, and flour, and bringing back teas and silks and return passengers.'

The military weakness of Canada is a topic on which Colonel Murray gives some wise advice. His admonition that the first duty of every citizen is to defend his hearth and home, not by paying someone else to do it for him, may well be taken to heart by others than Canadians.

The value of Colonel Murray's book is enhanced by a uniquely weighty and authoritative preface from the pen of Lord Roberts, who has presumably had access to confidential details of Japanese military matters. Not only in the final chapter, to which the veteran Field Marshal calls special attention, but on every page, he reads a personal summons to each Englishman to study for himself the questions which vitally affect the Empire. As the efficiency of the soldier depends on the stimulation of mental alertness and the development of individual initiative, so the efficiency of the citizen postulates a lively sense of the needs and claims of the land he is supposed to love, and a determination to consecrate some portion of his mind and time to its service.

GEORGE ARTHUR.

PLAYING AT SOLDIERS

THE amount of public, apart from expert military, interest evinced in the Army Bill is extraordinarily small. In the House of Commons every available seat was occupied during the sectarian wranglings which accompanied the various clauses of the Education Bill. At present, during the discussion of a measure which involves the protection of our country's shores and its very existence as a first-class Power, the interest shown by the great majority of members on both sides is languid, and the House could be 'counted out' again and again. It seems by this time almost impossible to infuse any deep or practical concern for military problems into the mass of our fellow-countrymen. This apathy, fraught as it is with real peril to our national welfare, is due very largely to a certain attitude taken up by politicians, generals and journalists during the progress of the South African war. It became fashionable to grossly exaggerate the military value of amateur soldiers. The brunt of such carnage as occurred in the war—at Colenso, Magersfontein, Spion Kop, and Paardeberg—was borne almost entirely by our Regulars. On the other hand, insignificant skirmishes and mere 'affairs of outposts' in which irregular troops took part were dignified by the name of 'engagements' and 'battles,' and the most fulsome praise was lavished on the untrained combatants. The absurd and mischievous statement that the 'colonies came to our aid and thus saved us from irretrievable disaster' is still made in after-dinner speeches and even in Parliament, and this point of view reached its climax in the late Mr. Seddon's boast that if Great Britain withdrew from South Africa the Colonial contingents would see the war brought to a successful finish!

The result of this 'playing to the gallery' on the part of our leaders was to stereotype in the mind of the average British citizen the comfortable belief, repeated again and again by persons in authority, that our Volunteers and Yeomanry were in every way the equals of highly trained and disciplined troops. That was the spurious 'lesson of the South African War' learnt by this country, which ignored the blunders, disasters and humiliations of the campaign and the fact that more than three-quarters of the 22,000 surrendered Boers were

armed with captured Lee-Enfields, and went back to its racing, its football and its self-complacency. 'Why be unduly excited about national defence? Invasion and conscription are alike unthinkable, and even if an invading army does reach our shores, and our Regulars are abroad, we shall have 300,000 men of the Territorial Army, and look what splendid work was achieved by such troops in South Africa!'

So it comes to pass that in the new Bill we are playing at soldiers once more. The 'clear thinking' of the able Minister who presides over the destinies of our Army has given us a remarkable scheme, sometimes described as a 'nation in arms' or a 'national army,' which depends entirely on the hypothetical patriotism of the community in general and 'County Associations' in particular.

The Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers have all their special grievances against the provisions of the new Bill. It is indeed not too much to say that the attitude of ninety per cent. of our Militia officers is one of indignation and dismay. The rank and file which they have hitherto commanded simply disappear, and *ex hypothesi* become metamorphosed into a 'Special Contingent' trained under totally different circumstances at our various depots. And here we may note that these boys, enlisted at seventeen, are to form an Army Reserve, liable at any moment to fill the depleted ranks of our regular battalions on foreign service. For this purpose they are to be trained in small groups by staff officers within the narrow limits of an English depot, which can afford practically no facilities for tactical exercises or field work on any appreciable scale. Will the average Militiaman enrol himself in the new Special Contingent? Militia officers of long standing say no: some, like the Duke of Bedford, point out that the Militia private, without any liability to serve abroad, has hitherto earned 7*l.* per annum: is it likely that he will undertake more onerous responsibilities for the 17*s.* 6*d.* a year he will receive for his fortnight's training? And what is to become of the derelict officers? They are as a rule drawn from a class different from that which furnishes our Volunteer officers, and I am informed that very few of the officers at present serving with our Militia regiments will throw in their lot with the new Territorial battalions. This resolve on their part, if resolve it be, is certainly not a creditable one, but we must deal with facts as we find them. And even if the existing officers of our Militia regiments express their willingness to join the new force, how in the world are questions of seniority to be arranged? Take, for example, a county with two Militia and two Volunteer battalions. The rank and file of the former will—it is assumed—be absorbed into the Special Contingent, and then for two battalions of the Territorial Army we may have perhaps four lieutenant-colonels, eight majors and so on. What is to happen? No answer has been as yet forthcoming to this one of the many military puzzles contained in the present Bill.

The grievances of the Yeomanry are less acute. They are, as a rule, commanded by officers who are 'well off' and lay themselves out to give their men a pleasant time in camp; and the shrinkage in the pay is probably more apparent than real. If, however, the new conditions of service in the Territorial Army unfortunately lead to a reduction in the strength of the Yeomanry, it may fairly be said that mounted men can better be spared than any other branch of the force. Our Yeomanry can never, with the very small amount of training at their disposal, be brought up to the level of cavalry fit to meet the trained cavalry of an invading army. Moreover, England is extremely ill adapted for the extensive use of cavalry, and the real utility of our Yeomanry in a war of invasion would be their employment as scouts. For this excellent and necessary work 25,000 men is even more than enough—especially when supplemented by cyclists.

How do the Volunteers regard the new Bill? Inasmuch as their present training is apparently to be the standard prescribed for the new Territorial Army, no complaints can be made on the ground of increased drills or any compulsory attendance at camp. But other considerations will almost certainly militate against the supply of recruits for the future. Those who have never served as officers in Volunteer battalions do not realise the immense difficulty which is frequently experienced, even under the easy-going conditions of service at present in force, in securing Volunteer recruits. There is one well-known Volunteer corps in the West of England which bestows a bonus of ten shillings upon any fortunate person who can persuade a recruit to come forward and be sworn in. In a midland county known to the writer the supply of recruits, which was fairly good before the present Bill was shaped, has now materially decreased, and the reason given for this diminution is that the men are full of suspicion and dislike for some of the suggested changes.

Practically all Volunteers, officers and men alike, will be keenly disappointed if Mr. Haldane persists in the abolition of the Regular adjutant. It is not too much to say that the efficiency of a Volunteer battalion is in many cases due to the adjutant more than to all the other officers put together. He possesses a knowledge of drill, tactics, the work of outposts, and so on which few amateurs can obtain, and his presence in camp provides a sort of 'guarantee of good faith' in the work of the battalion. If the Regular sergeant-instructors also—now the very mainspring of a company's efficiency in drill and musketry—are to be largely reduced in number (see Memo. Cd. 3296), one is at a loss to understand by what conceivable means outlying detachments in country districts are to be adequately drilled.

The rank and file very naturally resent the provision of only one suit of clothes per man. What are they to do when—as sometimes happens in camp—they return from field work drenched to

the skin? Do the military advisers of Mr. Haldane expect the men of the Territorial regiments to remain for the rest of the day in wet khaki? Moreover, the Volunteer is as proud of his well-cut tunic, red or otherwise, as his Regular comrade, and his smart appearance when he walks out, an object of admiration to his male and female friends, is a powerful stimulus to recruiting. The regulation which specifies a four years' enlistment and the infliction of a fine of 5*l.* in case that term of service is not completed is also calculated to alarm any young man of the poorer classes who has thoughts of joining the new force. Five pounds is a stupendous fine in the eyes of a labourer earning from 15*s.* to 1*l.* a week; and although the terrors of this penalty have been minimised by explanations in the House of Commons, such explanations cannot easily be conveyed to hundreds of thousands of men, and the mischief wrought by the ill-considered and tactless inclusion of this item in the Bill will, I am afraid, be difficult to eradicate.

Again, the Volunteer has, of course, never been granted any pay by the State during his camp training, but as half-a-crown has been given as a daily 'camp allowance' for each man, many battalions have distributed one shilling of this as pay and the remaining eighteenpence has served to provide the man with food and for incidental expenses. In future each man will receive 1*s.* 3*d.* as pay, including mess allowance, and, in addition, army rations. As a result of this, it is almost certain that in some corps at any rate the standard of feeding and general comfort will be appreciably lowered.

But by far the most serious obstacle to the success of the new Territorial Army arises from the virtual obligation of foreign service imposed upon its members. In theory of course no such obligation exists, and any active service beyond the shores of the British Island will be undertaken solely and entirely by the free choice of the Volunteer. But as a matter of fact what is contemplated is that units of the Territorial Army should volunteer for active service abroad in order to supply the wastage of war in the ranks of the 'striking force' and the Special Contingent. What would doubtless happen in any time of great national stress and peril would be this: a battalion would be drawn up on parade and the Colonel, after a short speech describing the country's urgent need for men, would encourage the battalion to offer its services and at the same time invite any of the men who were unwilling to serve abroad to step out of the ranks. It is easy to see that immense moral and social pressure would be brought to bear upon any who felt disposed to take the less heroic course, and practically everybody in the territorial battalion would follow the example of sixty-one embodied Militia regiments in 1900, whose officers, non-commissioned officers and men volunteered for active service in South Africa almost to a man.

Will the young man who formerly joined his local Volunteer corps

solely for the defence of his country against invasion be equally ready as a member of the Territorial Army to undertake the new and serious responsibility of foreign service? We may, no doubt, be reminded in reply of the Volunteer detachments which offered themselves for service in South Africa, and performed the work allotted to them in a soldierly and satisfactory manner. Now it is true that of some 300,000 Volunteers during the South African war about 60,000 offered themselves for service at the front, of whom some 20,000 were accepted. But this happened during the prevalence of an almost unexampled war-fever—a war-fever engineered by every unscrupulous device of the Colonial and British press, with rare exceptions. But what happened when the glamour of the campaign had dwindled almost to vanishing point? In December 1901, the War Office asked for 10,000 volunteers—not 4 per cent. of those who remained in England. The response was startling in its insignificance! Exactly 1,400 men volunteered, of whom the writer was one.

These facts do not encourage us to rely with much confidence on the readiness of any Territorial Army to volunteer for active service unless a war happens at the moment to be amazingly popular. And there is a minor point which serves to corroborate this belief. In 1905, during a time of profound peace, an unfortunate circular was issued by the War Office authorities inviting Volunteers to be medically examined with a view to test their fitness for active service abroad in case of necessity. The result was a widespread dissatisfaction, and in some cases acute ill-feeling and insubordination. The writer left the matter to the decision of the men of his company, and fifty per cent. of them declined to be examined. And it may be worth while to say in passing that such medical examination as did take place revealed the disquieting fact that owing to the prevalence of varicose veins, rupture, and other ailments a considerable number of our Volunteers, though passed into the ranks originally by the very lenient medical tests in vogue, would not in reality be able to undertake the wear and tear of a campaign.

Whether the units of the Territorial Army are willing or unwilling to serve abroad in times of national emergency, the most serious questions arise in this connection. It is at least conceivable that the vast majority of our Regular troops might be absent from these islands in Canada, Egypt, South Africa or Western Europe. The question of the neutrality of Belgium may be re-opened some day, and it seems almost certain that had German troops crossed the French frontier in connection with the Moroccan dispute of 1906, British troops would have been landed in Europe. If the invasion of India from the north-west ever takes place, the military problem before us is indeed stupendous. We are told by competent authorities that 500,000 men would be required for the first year, of which total

India could furnish a force of some 160,000 for service at the front apart from garrisons, lines of communication, &c. Without going into the question of the immense drafts which would be necessitated in subsequent years to repair the wastage of such a campaign, it is worth while to reflect on the moral effect which would be produced in England and in India by the more or less immediate despatch to the front of thousands of 'Territorial' soldiers, brave enough but with practically no training at all, to face the disciplined valour of the Russian armies. It is true that Siberian troops bore the brunt of the terrible fighting at the commencement of the recent war in the East, and that the majority of Edhem Pasha's victorious army in 1897 were militiamen and not 'Nizam' or regulars. But there is all the difference in the world between the military training of the Siberian infantryman or the Turkish 'Redif' and that which under the most favourable circumstances could have fallen to the lot of the 'Territorial' rank and file at the outbreak of a war.

The success of Mr. Haldane's scheme depends, of course, in the main on the patriotism of the community at large, but also in a minor degree on the patriotic energy of the 'County Associations.' 'The country gentlemen,' according to the War Minister, are to be 'given something to do'; the practical question is, are they likely to do it? As a rule, the most active and able men in country districts already have their hands pretty full, and, even apart from this, there is little in the past record of the 'landed gentry' to encourage us in the belief that they will apply themselves, heart and soul, to the support and maintenance of the Territorial Army. You do not change people's ἦθος by calling them members of an association, and what reason is there for thinking that the average 'country gentleman' will, in the future, display more patriotic zeal in connection with our national defences than he has exhibited in the past? Patriotism, indeed! Why is it that our Militia officers are no less than one thousand under strength? And how often does a 'country gentleman' encourage his son to serve in a Volunteer battalion? The 'national' and 'democratic' army is to depend for its supply of young officers on the Lords Lieutenant of the counties, who will also preside over the work of the associations. Many Volunteers keenly resent the prominence accorded to this obsolete official in Mr. Haldane's scheme. There are, it is true, Lords Lieutenant who are able and zealous men; but it is not too much to say that the majority of these dignitaries have never taken any active share in the encouragement or maintenance of our citizen army beyond, perhaps, the bestowal of a guinea or two on local prize funds.

These feudal 'Associations,' who are to control the destinies of 'a nation in arms,' are required, amongst other things, to furnish the Territorial battalions with adequate rifle ranges. If they fulfil this requirement, they will deserve the sincere gratitude of the nation.

But we are not very sanguine. In many places, no decent ranges can be secured for love or money. Some obstacle stands in the way—foxes, pheasants, the privacy of the estate, and so on. How can anyone expect the Territorial Army, under similar conditions, to raise its musketry above the indifferent level at present reached by our Volunteers?

Another of the duties assigned to the County Associations is 'establishing and maintaining or fostering and encouraging cadet battalions and corps and rifle clubs.' If this duty involves the expenditure of public money, it may fairly be demanded that nothing shall be contributed from the national exchequer to these secondary and subordinate organisations until the needs of the regular and auxiliary forces are fully met. In no case whatever should the taxpayer be called upon to subsidise cadet corps and rifle clubs unless they are established on military lines, with clearly defined obligations imposed upon their members. No such obligations can, of course, be laid upon toy regiments of small boys which are run to a large extent on a basis of gingerbeer and buns. So far from supporting any scheme of national defence, the membership of a public school corps is frequently urged as a reason for declining any further military service. The writer, in endeavouring to secure recruits for the Oxford University Volunteers, has, times without number, been met with the excuse: 'I served two years in my school corps, and I think I have done my share. I've no time up here for Volunteering; I want to row, or play football and cricket.' And so, out of some 2,500 young men at Oxford, with plenty of leisure at their disposal, barely five hundred are found who are willing to join the University battalion.

Again, many of the members of our English rifle clubs are senior men who could not conceivably be employed on active service or fairly invited to undertake such responsibilities; and unless the juniors who are not already 'territorials' definitely pledge themselves to join the county regiments in case of embodiment, they will, I feel sure, admit that no claim can be made out for any public subsidy to their funds. One cannot help suspecting that the attractiveness of such clubs, with their good-fellowship and prizes, may act as a positive deterrent from the more arduous, but infinitely more useful conditions of service in a territorial battalion.

And what, after all, is the real fighting value of the Territorial Army when, and if, you get the three hundred thousand men? That is the essential point which is never fairly faced by the people of this country.

In the report of the Norfolk Commission this somewhat startling pronouncement occurs: 'The Militia, in its existing condition, is unfit to take the field for the defence of the country.' Now, apart from the experimental six months' training undertaken by some regiments, the ordinary Militiaman receives sixty-three days' training

as a recruit, including fourteen days' musketry, and is then trained for twenty-seven days annually. Contrast with this the amount of military training which will fall to the lot of the 'Territorial' infantry soldier, who will really be a Volunteer under a different name. In his first year he will have to put in forty drills of one hour each; for his second, third, and fourth years he will be required to drill for ten hours per annum. The annual camp-training of eight or fifteen days—an experience which, from a military point of view, is far more valuable than all the squad and company drills put together—need not necessarily be undertaken at all, though it is probable that a very considerable percentage of the men will be willing to go under canvas for the shorter period of eight days. Surely, if the Militia under existing conditions are 'unfit to take the field for the defence of their country,' this verdict applies *a fortiori* to the future battalions of the Territorial Army! The originators of the scheme point by way of answer to the embodiment of our second line, which will be brought about by the prospect of a big war or its actual outbreak. The Territorial regiments will, it is alleged, be adequate, after six months' hard training, to meet any demands which may be made upon them. After six months! Is it likely that any hostile European Power which definitely includes the invasion of England in its military programme will delay the attempt for six months? The wars of the future will in all likelihood be rapid growths, and momentous action will follow speedily upon the heels of the formal declaration of hostilities. But even if in the absence of our Regulars the God of Battles vouchsafes our Territorial Forces six months' training before the invader attempts to set foot in England, and that attempt is successful, the opposing forces will be constituted as follows. The average Englishman will have had six months' training, plus fifty hours' squad and company drill, plus a fortnight in camp. The invaders will, it may be safely assumed, consist of the picked troops of a great Continental army who have undergone a severe discipline and scientific training for at least two or three years. Major Seeley, during a Parliamentary panegyric on the value of Colonial troops in particular and amateur soldiers in general, declared that in one case in South Africa a single hairdresser behind a pom-pom or a field-gun had held at bay a considerable force of British troops. But if any Continental guns are ever disembarked on our coasts, they will be worked by men of a still more formidable type than the Boer in question! What would be the result of a conflict between forces so unevenly matched? Making full allowance for the natural courage of our race and the tremendous enthusiasm aroused by the defence of our country and our homes, can any of us who have studied military problems or gained practical knowledge of the meaning of war feel reasonably certain of our army's success? Dress your Territorial Army as you will, organise them as well as you can, appoint as many brigadier-generals

to command them as you like; they will, *unless they are trained for longer periods*, remain the merest amateurs. And the voice of history and experience tells us that sooner or later the amateur goes down before the professional in all walks of life. The quality of mere animal courage is far more evenly distributed amongst mankind than is sometimes imagined. The chief factor which differentiates between the first-rate and the second-rate soldier is nothing more or less than training and discipline. As with advancing civilisation the amenities of life increase there will be less and less of natural inclination to risk it. And the thing which leads a soldier to keep his head above the parapet of a trench when the shrapnel are bursting, or to jump up from behind his anthill or rock for another rush towards the enemy's earth-works in front—the *vera causa* of this phenomenon is the habit of drill, discipline, and obedience to orders. There is no royal road to military efficiency; like most things worth having in this world, it can be reached only by hard work and self-sacrifice; we shall not secure it by 'playing at soldiers.' Captain Tulloch, the author of an able paper in a recent number of the *Journal of the United Service Institution*, only repeats the almost universal verdict of military experts when he declares that if a German detachment of two hundred and fifty men met a battalion of British troops trained on the present Volunteer lines, they would 'go through them like a knife through butter.'

How, then, can we provide ourselves with a Home Army which may be relied upon with confidence to render successful invasion a practical impossibility? There are two alternatives. The first is compulsory service on the lines adopted by every civilised nation except Great Britain and the United States. No words need be wasted over this suggestion, for the simple reason that, quite apart from the merits and demerits of the scheme, the people of this country flatly refuse to entertain it. No British Government dare introduce a measure of conscription or compulsory military training, which, while it would provide us with an absolute guarantee for England's security, seems utterly foreign to the temper and spirit of our people.

I venture to think that there is only one possible alternative—not by any means a counsel of perfection, but the best we can hope for. Boldly face the difficulties involved in such differentiation, organise a portion of the new Territorial Force on the basis of a solid month's training per annum, and regard the rest as a kind of *landwehr*, trained on the lines proposed in the Bill. Recognise once and for all that we cannot get really adequate work, military or otherwise, out of our fellow-citizens unless we pay them fairly for such work; recognise further that a Volunteer who gives up a month or a week—in many cases his entire 'holidays'—has clearly a right to receive a *far higher rate of pay* than a professional soldier who makes the Army his career for the time being. The material of our Volunteer battalions at present and our Territorial Army of the future is splendid,

probably without its equal in the world, and greatly superior in many ways to that from which our Militia lads are recruited. The majority of our 'Territorial' recruits would doubtless refuse to undergo a month's training under stringent conditions, but you would in all probability find, say, sixty thousand men who would undertake these terms of service *provided you paid them well* during their time in camp —that is the crux of the whole question. We should in this way possess for home defence, in addition to such Regulars as were available, and the 'Special Contingent' in our depots, some sixty thousand 'Territorials' of fine physique and morale, with a good month's training every year to their credit, and, as a last line, some 240,000 'reserves' who had undergone the modicum of training and musketry suggested in the Bill for the entire force.

The nation is grateful to Mr. Haldane for the untiring devotion which characterises his work; military experts are grateful to him for the courage and straightforward character of a scheme which has reduced the chaos of our defensive forces to something like order; and all of us who have willingly served in the auxiliary forces, and intend to persevere in that loyal service whatever shape the Bill may take, owe the War Minister an especial debt of gratitude, because for the first time in our recent history a British Government has taken the auxiliary forces seriously. Those who have not served as officers in a Volunteer corps little realise what we have had to endure in the past from stupid ridicule—England is the only country in the world where a man could be laughed at for wearing his King's uniform—from social disparagement, and, worst of all, fulsome flattery which we well knew to be undeserved.

I venture to say in conclusion that my sole motive in writing this article has been the desire to see the Bill so altered that it may help more effectually to guarantee the inviolability of our shores. People who profess to love their country, but absolutely decline to defend it, and openly allege their complete ignorance of military matters, assert that invasion is impossible. The answer to this dogmatism is that practically every military expert in this country and on the Continent, while acknowledging the difficulties of an invasion of Great Britain, regards these difficulties as not necessarily insurmountable. I am a Radical who declared the South African campaign to be unnecessary and impolitic; I have no objection to the epithet of 'Little Englander;' I have seen too much of war to glory in it, and Imperialism has few charms for me. All I want is the security of my country, and the more I have seen of practical soldiering in different parts of the world, the more deeply I have realised the immense peril we incur from our inveterate habit of 'playing at soldiers,' and the more thoroughly felt the significance of the late Sir George Chesney's words—'a nation which is too selfish to defend its liberty deserves to lose it.'

E. N. BENNETT.

'THE ANGELIC COUNCIL'

'LET US MAKE MAN.'—Gen. i. 26. It is an old and much-disputed question among commentators how this *usus loquendi* is to be interpreted. On the threshold of Revelation, when the Almighty puts forth His creating power, a diversity of agents seems to be at work. A short and simple solution is that of the grammarians, that it is merely the 'plural of majesty' or royalty that is here employed. 'The King is as a thousand of the people' (2 Sam. xviii. 3), and fulness of power and attributes may be expressed by plurality. This explanation is now generally surrendered. 'We' as the royal style was not used by Oriental potentates, but the simple autocratic 'I.' The interpretation very generally adopted by the patristic writers and later theologians was that we have here an adumbration of the doctrine of the Trinity,[1] in a consultation of the Divine Persons among themselves. But such a proleptic occurrence of a doctrine not revealed till long afterwards would be a complete anachronism. To find Trinitarian language in an early Hebrew document would be no less preposterous than to put metaphysical terminology in the mouth of an infant. Some writers conceive the creating words as having been addressed specifically to the mediating Logos, to Michael,[2] or to the Son.[3] So Milton:

> The omnipotent
> Eternal Father (for where is not He
> Present) thus to His Son audibly spake:
> 'Let us make now man in our image, man
> In our similitude.'—*Par. Lost*, vii. 516-520.

And before him Joshua Sylvester:

> He consults with 's only Son
> (His own true Pourtrait) what proportion,
> What gifts, what grace, what soule He should bestowe
> Vpon His *Vice-Roy* of this Realm belowe.[4]

König and others suggest that the plural in a self-invitation to action has only a psychological origin.

[1] Aug. *De Trin.* vii. 6, 12; Arnobius, &c.
[2] So Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 229. See Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, 105.
[3] Origen, *Contra Cels.* v. 37 *sub fin.*
[4] *Divine Weekes and Workes*, 1621, 125.

Then afterward they said,
Taking strange counsel, as if He who worked
Hitherto should not henceforth work alone:
'Let us make man'; and God did look upon
That Divine Word which was the form of God.[5]

In the present paper I propose to examine the passage in the light of an ancient Semitic tradition which has left distinct traces in many other parts of Scripture, and helps to explain not a few allusions which would otherwise remain obscure. It has been proved to demonstration that the earlier chapters of Genesis have parallels and correspondences with the old Babylonian tablets,[6] both evidently belonging to a common Semitic tradition. The compiler of Genesis was inspired to eliminate and reject all the mythological and polytheistic elements in the ancient documents which were repugnant to the pure monotheism of the Hebrew faith; but we cannot be greatly surprised if some small details, which were implicit and latent in the original records, now and again either escaped his vigilance, or possibly were let pass as susceptible of a harmless meaning. To the latter class probably belongs the statement that Jahveh, the Supreme Deity, had some co-operating helpers whom He admitted to His counsel when about to create the highest of His creatures, saying 'Let us make man.' We shall see that such a Divine council of Heavenly Beings was familiar in the land from which the Hebrews emigrated, and the conception may probably have been a part of their inherited beliefs. It will be well, however, to begin our investigation by inquiring what meaning was attached to the passage by Jewish writers.

The prevailing tradition among the Rabbins seems to have been that God associated with Himself a 'consultative Sanhedrim of angels' with whom He condescended to take counsel and whom He permitted to co-operate with Himself in the work of man's creation.[7] According to the Talmud, God, enthroned in the seventh heaven, is encircled by His ministering angels, the Chajoth, the Ophannim, and the Seraphim, and 'He executes no decree without first consulting His Heavenly Host.'[8] So Abulpharaj, Rab Akha, and other authorities quoted in Malan, *Book of Adam and Eve*, pp. 209–16. The 'Chronicles of Jerahmeel' record that 'when God wished to create the world He called the company of angels, commanded by the archangel Michael, and said unto them "Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness"' (ed. Gaster, vi. 3, p. 14). St. Basil refers to this as a well-known Jewish belief.[9] To one inquiring 'Why was the plural?' Rabbi Yochanan replied, 'Because the Holy One, blessed be He!

[5] J. Ingelow, *Poems*, 1885, i. 280; *cf.* Prov. viii. 22–30.
[6] See Zimmern, *The Babylonian and Hebrew Genesis*, 1–64.
[7] Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 749.
[8] Kalisch, *Leviticus*, ii. 308. [9] *Hexameron*, ix. c. 6.

never does anything without consulting the Supernal Family [=the angels]; as it is said, "This matter is by decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the Holy Ones"' (Dan. iv. 17).[10] It is not merely that God imparts to the angels His intention to create a superior being to any He had yet made, and admits their presence as keenly interested spectators (as in Job xxxviii. 7), but He allows them to share in this creation as joint-workers with Himself. It was similarly believed that when Jahveh Elohim, in Gen. iii. 22, said 'The man is become as one of *us*,' He is referring to His heavenly subordinates, the Elohim, whom He associated with Himself in working as well as in name. It was a knowledge like theirs to which Adam had attained by his offence; and the Jewish targumist adds that the Lord God said to His ministering angels, 'Let us decree to drive Adam out of Eden since he has transgressed.'[11] 'We gave him work,' say the angels in the 'Book of Jubilees,' 'and we instructed him to do everything that is suitable for tillage' (iii. 15, ed. Charles).

Philo's explanation is to the same effect, that God in saying 'Let us make man' assumed other beings to Himself as assistants.[12] The plurality of makers indicates that the Father is conferring with His 'powers' (*δυνάμεις*),[13] Philo meaning by His 'powers' the *Elohim* or angelic agencies who as subordinate 'words' (*λόγοι*), act as intermediate helpers under the Divine Word, and form an attendant body-guard of the Almighty. Ideas analogous to these were, no doubt, present to the mind of the writer of Genesis, and many allusions in other parts of Scripture point to the same conclusion. *Elohim*, 'the Powers,' and *Qedoshim*, 'the Holy Ones,' are used for God conjoined with His executive angels, as we might speak of 'the staff' of the Heavenly Army, or 'the Court' on high.

Dr. Driver remarks that in early times 'the distinction between God and Divine beings was not so clearly drawn by the Hebrews as it is by us.'[14] Not only are the angels called 'the sons of God,' but they share with Him the common title of *Elohim*, so that it sometimes becomes a matter of difficulty to decide whether the true reference is to them or to God. In Psalm viii. 5, was man 'made a little lower than God' (R.V.), or 'than the angels' (LXX)? Delitzsch and others consider that man is there represented as little inferior to the angels, in whose likeness he was made when God associated them with Himself in His creation. It is to be noted as of importance that the correct rendering of Ecclesiastes xii. 1 is 'Remember thy *Creators* in the days of thy youth'; and, further, that St. Thomas Aquinas, as a theologian, admits 'there may have been some ministry of angels in connection with the formation of the body of man, as there may

[10] Hershon, *Talmudic Com. on Genesis*, 64. Similarly in the Parsi Gâthas the address 'you' takes in Ahuramazda and the Ameshaspentas, Haug, *Parsis*, 305.

[11] *Targ. Jonathan, in Gen.* iii. [12] *De Mundi op.* xxiv. [13] *De Fug.* xiij.

[14] *Comm. on Gen.* iii. 5. At a later time Isaiah thinks it necessary to insist 'Jehovah who created the heaven He is the Divine-Powers' (ha-Elôhîm, xlv. 18).

be hereafter with regard to the Resurrection' (*Compendium of the Summa Theologica*, pt. 2, ch. 91, Eng. trans. 1906, p. 232).

This council of chosen angels God was believed to convene when ordinances or operations of His providential government of more than ordinary importance were to be carried out. He calls the attention of these heavenly counsellors to the presumption of the builders of Babel, and takes them into His plan for frustrating their ambition: 'Come, let us go down and there confound their language' (Gen. xi. 7). So in the 'Book of Jubilees' where the angels are made to say 'We descended with the Lord to see the city and the tower' (x. 23).[15] A very analogous conception in an inscription of Ramses the Third may be compared, where the god who exists by himself, Ra, on hearing the words that men had spoken against him, decrees their destruction: and summons before his face the ancient deities who were with him in the primordial world, that he may take counsel with them what he shall do to his revolting subjects.[16]

A vivid presentment of the heavenly Court is given in Micaiah's vision (1 Kings xxii. 19 f.), where Jahveh is seen seated on His throne, with the celestial host standing in attendance on His right hand and on His left. He consults with them at length as to which of their number shall undertake the office of betraying Ahab to his destruction. He listens to their proposals, as one says on this manner and another says on that manner. Eventually He accepts the offer of one spirit which volunteers for the service, and after inquiring his proposed mode of procedure despatches him to earth. A similar scene occurs in Job i. 6. This vision no doubt accurately portrays the contemporary conception of Jahveh and his counsellors.[17] A like anthropomorphic vision is given in Isaiah vi. 1 *seq.* Jahveh is seen seated on a lofty throne in His Palace (Heb. *hekal*=Assyr. *e-kal*, 'a great house') with His royal robe widely extended over the pavement. The Great King takes counsel with His trusted ministers who stand in waiting, and asks, 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us*?' (ver. 8). The mission is the joint action of Himself and His angelic courtiers as of a Heavenly Cabinet. There is a plain allusion also in Job xv. 18, where Eliphaz mocks at Job's assumption of wisdom, and asks him if he had helped with the creation:

> Wast thou brought forth before the hills?
> Didst thou attend in the council of God?

i.e. when the creation of the world was being deliberated wast thou in the secrets of the conclave? In quite a similar way in Jeremiah (xxviii. 18) false prophets are rebuked with the question whether they had been 'in the council of Jahveh.' The word for 'council' in

[15] So *Targ. Yer. on Gen.* xi. 7; *Pirke R. El.* (*Jewish Encyclopædia*, i. 587); Kalisch, *Leviticus*, ii. 308.

[16] Naville, *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.* viii. 412, 420.

[17] 'A celestial deliberative assembly.' Kautsch in Hastings' *B.D.* v. 643.

either case is *sôd*, which is literally a synedrion or 'sitting together,' the session (sederunt) of a deliberative assembly.[18] This explains a recondite allusion in the *Religio Medici* of learned Sir Thomas Browne: 'I was not only before myself but Adam, that is, in the idea of God, and *the decree of that synod* held from all eternity' (sec. lix.).

This conception of a Heavenly Council, in which the angels who partake of God's wisdom (2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 28) assemble, occurs several times in the Psalms.

> The heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Jahveh,
> Thy faithfulness also in the assembly of the holy ones . . .
> Who among the sons of God is like unto Jahveh?
> A God very terrible in the council of the holy ones,
> And to be feared above all them that stand round about Him.
>
> Ps. lxxxix. 5–7.

The Holy Ones (*Qĕdôshîm*) or Elohim, who encircle Him in solemn assembly, form the angelic court (*sôd*):[19]

> God standeth in the assembly of Elohim,
> He judgeth among the Elohim.—Ps. lxxxii. 1.

And a like meaning if we follow the LXX and Vulgate is to be found in Psalm cxxxviii. 1:

> I will give Thee thanks with my whole heart;
> Before the Elohim [= angels] will I sing praises unto Thee.

The same idea underlay the prevalent Jewish tradition that the angels took an active part in the giving of the Law on Sinai, as assessors to God in announcing its ordinances (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19), a belief grounded on the statement of Deut. xxxiii. 2, that when Jahveh beamed forth upon the mountain 'He came out of Holy Myriads,' *i.e.* a countless number of attendant angels; for, as the LXX adds, 'the angels were with Him on His right hand.' In the 'Book of Jubilees,' however, only the Angel of the Presence acts as intermediary in giving the Law to Moses (i. 27); but He bore the name of 'Angel of a Great Council' (LXX, Isaiah ix. 6). Compare Ps. lxviii. 17. This chief of the angels is the Divine Logos, and probably identical with the Interpreter Angel of Job xxxiii. 23, who is 'one of the thousand,' the exponent, apparently, of the definite number of chosen ones who stand nearest to God and form the Privy Council of heaven, the elect or chosen angels of 1 Tim. v. 21. Some might here venture to compare the Chaldæan 'counsellor deities,' of a planetary nature, some of whom were named 'interpreters' and 'judges.'[20] A much surer comparison is that of the 'watchers,' the sleepless angels who form the Heavenly Council and by whose decree men are sentenced to

[18] Others connect *sôd* with Syr. *sĕwādā*, talk, as if 'parliament.'

[19] See G. H. Pember, *The Church and the Mysteries*, 369 *seq.*; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 749.

[20] *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.* ii. 148; Pusey, *Daniel*, 527.

punishment (Dan. iv. 17; Book of Enoch, xii. 2, 3).[21] They act as assessors to the Supreme Judge, and will appear with Him on the Mount of Olives in the Day of Judgment (Zech. xiv. 5). The passages we have been considering which represent the angels as an assembly or court auxiliary to the Almighty, and, in particular, as encircling Him on the mountain top, find their best interpretation in the prophecy of Isaiah (xiv. 13), where a presumptuous monarch vaunts that he would scale the skies and usurp the very seat of God in the mount of the heavenly assembly: 'I will ascend to the heavens, above the stars of Elohim I will exalt my throne; I will sit on the mountain of assembly in the recesses of the north.' The mount of assembly is the holy mount of Elohim in Ezekiel xxviii. 13, but the words being placed in the mouth of a Babylonian king have an evident reference to Babylonian beliefs, and the same remark applies to the conceptior of the 'watchers' above. As a matter of fact the Mount of the World (*Kharsag Kurkura*) on which the gods dwelt is frequently mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions, and the temple E-Sharra, 'the House of Assembly,' or of the host of gods, was built as a representation of it.[22] Besides this Mount of Assembly which lay to the north, the legendary quarter sacred to divinities, the Babylonian religion knew of another meeting-place of the gods which lay on the Eastern horizon.[23] This was Ubshu-Kenna, 'the Brilliant Chamber'; it was there that Marduk proposed to his father, Ea, in the assembly of the gods that he should create man by taking of [his own] flesh and bone, and it was with the concurrence and approval of this divine council that Marduk, himself styled 'the counsellor of the gods,' went forth as their champion to quell the dragon-power of chaos. Indeed the creation tablets (vi) expressly state that a council of the gods was summoned in order to authorise and empower Marduk to undertake the work of creation.[24] In accepting the commission he addresses his fellow-deities with the words, 'In Ubshu-Kenna assembled come ye joyfully together.' Another tablet refers to living creatures, cattle, and the beasts of the field as having been produced by the gods in their assembly;[25] and a hymn to Marduk thus addresses him:

> Creator of grain and plants, who caused the green herb to spring up,
> Who is revered in the house of counsel.

See Boscawen, *First of Empires*, 309.

In the earliest times it is Ea, with whom Hommel would equate the Hebrew Jah, that is found presiding over the assembled deities, who are grouped as a kind of court around him. But this presidency

[21] *Jewish Encyclopædia*, i. 590; Kalisch, *Lev.* ii. 289.

[22] Hommel, *Die Insel der Seligen*, 35; Boscawen, *Bible and Monuments*, 153; Schrader, *Cun. Insc.* ii. 79; Radau, *Creation Story*, 55.

[23] Jastrow, *Rel. of Babylonia and Assyria*, 630.

[24] Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch*, 124; King, *Bab. Religion*, 58–66; Jastrow, 422–3; Hastings, *B.D.* v. 572.

[25] King, 81. Sayce, *Gifford Lectures*, 394

was afterwards transferred to the kindly mediating god Marduk, who in all probability was the very being that Abram worshipped for the first seventy years of his life, and must therefore have largely coloured his religious conceptions.[26] It is certainly remarkable that the Genesis narrative which allows the Divine powers (Elohim) to participate in man's creation, although Jahveh Himself is the Supreme Creator, agrees with the old Semitic tradition as preserved in the Babylonian Creation Tablets, which, while representing Ea as the sovereign god, admit not only his son Marduk but the subordinate deities as a body to take part in making the world. Similarly in another series, when the deluge is about to be sent upon the earth, it is determined by the gods in council, and when Ishtar afterwards repented of her assent she lamented, 'Because I assented to an evil thing in the council of the gods.'[27] So in the Gilgamesh tablet x:

> The Anunnaki, the great gods, are assembled,
> Mammitum, maker of fates, sets with them the destinies.[28]

'Assur, the great Lord, King of all the assembly of the great gods,' occurs in an inscription of Shalmaneser;[29] and 'I confess to thee, Nebo, in the assembly of the great gods,' in a prayer of Assurbanipal.[30]

The Tel-el-Amarna tablets have shown us that the religious ideas of Babylonia were well known in Palestine about 1500 B.C., and it is quite possible that it was from the Canaanite inhabitants that the Israelites adopted some of their minor beliefs which were already familiar to them in part from the Abrahamite tradition. Among these we may perhaps number the idea of an angelic council subsidiary to the God of Heaven.[31]

Further developments of the conception are not wanting. The Council of Angels, presided over by the Almighty, was from another point of view regarded as the family of which He was the head. The angels, the 'Sons of God' (Elohim), or partakers of the Divine nature, and God Himself (Elohim) their Father, together constituted the celestial family, with features of subordination and union similar to those of an earthly household. When God says 'Let us make man,' He so speaks, according to Rabbi Yochanan, because 'the Holy One, blessed be He! never does anything without consulting the Supernal Family.'[32] In Talmudic literature the upper household (*familia*) consisting of *'elyônim* (*superi*), the angels of the heavenly court, are often contrasted with Israel, His servants on earth.[33] Thus Rab

[26] Radau, 57–59. [27] King, 127, 134. [28] Pinches, *O. Test. and Babylonia*, 100.
[29] *Records of the Past*, iii. 82. [30] *R.P.* (new ser.), vi. 104.
[31] The prevalence of the idea is shown by the repudiation of it in the *Book of Enoch*: 'Ten thousand times ten thousand were before Him; but He required not any holy counsel,' xiv. 22.
[32] Hershon, *Genesis*, 62; Driver, *Gen.* 14. *P'malyâh shel mâ'lah*, 'the Family above.'
[33] *Jewish Encyclopædia*, i. 585.

Saphra used to offer a prayer, 'May it please Thee, O Lord our God, to maintain peace in the family above as well as in the family below,'[34] which may help to throw some light on the somewhat enigmatical exclamation 'Peace in Heaven!' (St. Luke xix. 36), with which the Pharisaic party greeted the coming of Messiah. A further allusion may be noticed in Ephesians iii. 15, which—though it has escaped the observation of the commentators *in loco*—serves to show that this Rabbinical idea was, as we might expect, familiar to St. Paul. It is there stated that there is a family in heaven which owns the same Divine Fatherhood as every family upon earth—the angelic as well as the human brotherhood. It further appears that the exalted beings who were admitted to share in the Divine counsels were privileged to occupy seats or thrones in the Heavenly Council chamber. In Daniel vii. 9, when the Ancient of Days doth sit, a number of thrones are set for the angelic assessors who attend Him in His judgment. Similarly in the Book of Wisdom, xiii. 18, the Almighty Word who leaps down from heaven to inflict judgments on the earth is said to descend out of God's royal thrones (plur., not 'throne' as in the A.V.). The being intended is probably the Metatron, or Metathronos,[35] the Divine Word, who sits amidst the thrones (*meta thronous*), occupying the position nearest to the throne of the Father. It is the Angel of His Face or Presence (Is. lxiii. 9), the Mediator and Protector of Israel, the Prince of the Angels, and one with Michael.[36] The Metatron is mentioned first in the Babylonian Talmud, and corresponds, apparently, to the Babylonian *ur-sag*, the chief attendant or prime minister, through whom En-lil, 'the King of heaven and earth,' speaks, acts, and reveals himself. This *ur-sag*, or head minister, is Nin-gir-su, whom Radau identifies with the Angel of Jahveh's presence.[37]

A presentment similar to that in Daniel occurs in the Apocalyptic Vision of St. John (Rev. iv. 4), where four-and-twenty thrones are seen encircling (κυκλόθεν) the central throne, each occupied by a judicial assessor of venerable aspect. We may compare in the 'Book of Jubilees,' 'all the angels of the Presence and all the angels of sanctification, these two great classes, He hath bidden us to keep the Sabbath with Him in heaven and on earth' (ii. 18).

In the 'Ascension of Isaiah' (first century A.D.) the thrones have become a distinct order of angels. 'It is He alone to whose voice all the heavens and thrones give answer' (viii. 8, and vii. 15, ed. Charles, and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Levi*, 3). Hence St. Paul (Col. i. 16) gives the name of 'thrones' to the highest or regal rank of the celestial hierarchy who dwell in the seventh heaven in the immediate presence of God.

[34] Hershon, 330.

[35] Metatron was held to be the chief of the five angel-princes. Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 747.

[36] *Jewish Encycl.* viii. 519, *seq.*

[37] *Story of Genesis*, 48.

It is these exalted angels, no doubt, which in the Biblical narrative were conceived as co-operating in the work of man's creation. The conception is one less familiar and agreeable to Christian exegetes than it was to Jewish. It seemed to trench on the supreme prerogative of the one Creator, that created beings should be workers together with God. It is possible to see, however, that the Jewish understanding of the creating 'we' helps to remove a glaring difficulty in the narrative which the commentators, with a strange unanimity, have agreed to ignore. I mean the statement that man was made in the image of God. They have thought it sufficient to suggest that this refers to the rational, moral, and spiritual side of man's nature which has affinities with the Divine. But what about the corporeal part? Is this no true part of man? Adam was not created an unbodied spirit, but a compound creature, consisting of a lower bodily nature, fashioned in the first place, to which a higher spiritual nature was added. According to the common exegesis, this original and fundamental part of his constitution (Gen. ii. 7) was not made in the likenes s of anything in the heavens above, and has no reference made to it in the statement that 'Elohim created man in His own likeness.' Obviously the difficulty is that the corporeal cannot resemble the purely spiritual. But if with the Jewish writers, and probably the author of Genesis, we take Elohim to mean the Divine beings, the company of heaven, who are not pure spirit in the sense that God is, the difficulty disappears. Revelation rather leads us to believe that the angels have a form, and a form akin to the human. Whenever they have appeared on earth it was always as men (Gen. xviii. 19; xix. 5; Ezek. ix. 10; St. Mark xvi. 5; Acts i. 10, &c.). It is always taken for granted that for anthropomorphic reasons these angelic visitors merely assumed the human form for the nonce; but it is equally open to belief that this may have been their proper and original shape, and that it is men who have been made in their semblance, and not *vice versa*, because at the Creation man was made a little lower than the Elohim (angels), and in their likeness. Since to the author of Genesis the angels (Elohim) were beings who wore a similar form to that of men, and could hold intercourse with women after the manner of men (vi. 4), he had no difficulty in conceiving that men were made in their 'image' or shape (*tzelem*), a word which properly suggests the idea of external and material resemblance. On the other hand, the words 'after our likeness' (*demûth*) are rather suggestive of ideal and abstract agreement.[38] Thus the twofold phrase might mean, Let us, Jahveh and the angels, the Elohim or Divine beings, make man, on his corporeal side in the angelic form, hereafter to be called human. while I, Jahveh, make him after My Godlike semblance, with an intellectual and spiritual nature resembling My Own. This was the view held by Philo (*De*

[38] Maimonides, *Guide to the Perplexed*, pt. i. ch. i.; and so Driver.

Fug. xiii.), by Abenezra, Maimonides, and Ben Melech. The latter, *e.g.*, says that Adam was created in the image of angels, with breath given him by God Himself.[39] Thus the angels were the true 'Adam Kadmon' of the Kabalists, the original type of humanity, or pattern in the heavens, of which the earthly Adam was an image.[40] There is a reference in the Book of Job to this primeval or archetypal man, who sat in the Council of God before the creation of the world and shared in the Divine wisdom. Eliphaz questions Job with the words:

> Art thou the first man that was born?
> Or wast thou brought forth before the hills?
> Didst thou listen in the council of God? (xv. 7, 8),

i.e. when the creation was planned, and the words 'Let us make man' were spoken. A passage curiously similar to this occurs in the *Sartor Resartus*: 'Was Man with his experience present at the Creation to see how it all went on? . .'. Did the Maker take them [scientific individuals] into His counsel?' (bk. iii. ch. 8).

Rabbi Judah a Levi adds that the angels to whom God then spoke, and to whom the prophets in human shape were made like, were called the Metatron and 'the Man on high' (*Adam 'elyôn*); and that terrestrial man being similar to them is in a secondary sense made in the likeness of God.[41] The Kabalists, in the 'Zohar,' explain that the Lord, when He said 'Let us make man,' using the plural, spoke to the angelic beings, requiring their help, because, if he were made directly by Himself, he would be entirely divine, 'therefore, let the body be furnished by you, and I will supply the other portion, which is the soul.'[42] Delitzsch, indeed, contemplates it as psychologically possible that while man derived his spiritual nature immediately from God, he received his bodily part mediately from those who already, by creation, bore the image of God. He is a son of the Heavenly Family, which consists of God and His angels.[43]

That the twofold elements of man's nature must have a twofold origin, as Philo argued, is an idea already developed in the *Timæus* of Plato,[44] and assumed a prominent position in the speculations of the Gnostic sects. It was probably rooted in the conviction that the transcendent God is separated from matter by an infinite gulf which must be spanned by some intermediary. The intervention of some beings other than pure spirit is demanded by a material creation. That which is born of the spirit is spirit, but that which is flesh is generated otherwise. Some such idea possibly underlay the words 'Let us make man,' which find an echo in the teaching of the Gnostic

[39] *Miclol. Yophi*, Gen. i., in Malan, *Book of Adam and Eve*, 213, col. 2.
[40] Etheridge, *Heb. Literature*, 305, 317. See Stier, *Words of the Angels*, xix.
[41] Manasseh ben Israel, *The Conciliator* (1632), i. 14 (ed. 1842).
[42] *Ibid.* [43] *Biblical Psychology*, 79.
[44] 'Of the Divine part the Deity Himself was the Creator, but the creation of the mortal part He committed to His offspring, the lesser deities' (ch. xliv.).

Ophites. They represented the Creator, or Demiurge, whom they called Ialdabaoth, as commissioning the six planetary angels, over whom he presided, to create man in their own image as the crowning proof of their creative energy. To the mere corporal form produced by them Ialdabaoth himself imparts the breath of a living soul. As he is of the same nature as the six starry angels of whom he is the head, there is no doubt a personification here of the seven planets as angelic beings. In exactly the same manner Ahura-Mazda, the supreme Spirit of Zoroastrian belief, was counted in with the six Ameshaspentas as forming the seven potent and 'immortal benefactors with the watchful eyes,'[45] and this was derived from the Babylonian star-cult of the seven planets.[46]

To the same source may be traced 'the Seven Administrators' (*dioiketæ*) who co-operate with God, according to Hermes Trismegistus, in the making of man.[47] These gods, who 'encompass in circles the sensible world,' as Superior Intelligences or principal angels 'distribute of the seminal nature,' and 'each by his proper power sets forward that ordained to him.'[48] These, again, can hardly be separated from the seven archangels, 'the holy ones who watch,' of the Book of Enoch (xxi. 357, ed Charles); 'the watchers' of Daniel iv. 13, 17, the exalted class of angels who form God's 'counsel of the holy ones.'[49]

> The seven
> Who in God's presence, nearest to His throne,
> Stand ready at command, and are His eyes
> That run through all the heavens.[50]

Indeed, a crowd of analogous ideas, which we can only glance at, demand comparison here: 'the Divine Seven' of the Babylonian mythology, who seem to be the seven Igigi, or spirits of heaven; 'the seven holy angels' of Tobit xii. 15, 'which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One'; 'the seven angels which stand before God' (Rev. viii. 2); 'the seven spirits which are before His throne' (Rev. i. 4); 'the seven spirits of God and the seven stars' (Rev. i. 20; iii. 1). All alike appear to be ultimately traceable to the seven planets, conceived as ministering spirits who carried out the Divine plans in the government of the world, and exercised especially a powerful astrological influence over the body of man, as the use of such terms as 'jovial,' 'saturnine,' 'mercurial,' still attests.[51] Hence probably arose

[45] Haug, *Parsis*, 210, 305. Compare 'the six white ones' of *Enoch*, &c. 21, and Ezek. ix. 2.

[46] Cheyne, *Encycl. Bibl.* 167 note. [47] *Poemandres*, i. 9–16.

[48] *Ibid.* iii. 1, 3. [49] *Jewish Encycl.* i. 590.

[50] Milton, *Paradise Lost*, iii. 648–51. 'The seven angels which were created first minister before Him within the curtain.'—*Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, i. 10.

[51] Dionysius the Areopagite regards the Seven Orders of Angels next after the Seraphim and Cherubim as Intelligences of the seven planets. So T. Heywood, *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*, 1635. J. Colet, *On the Hierarchies of Dionysius*, 19, ed. Lupton.

the further belief that their instrumentality was involved in the creation of man, an idea thus expressed in a Gnostic apocryphon, the Codex Nasaræus, 'Arise, O Adam, shake off thy foul body, house of clay, which the seven star-angels made for thee' (p. 141).[52]

Further parallels to the Heavenly Council of the Hebrews and the collaborating angels might be adduced from the Ethnic religions if space allowed. We might refer to the associate deities in a mythological text who assist the Egyptian sun-god Tmu in creating the body of man;[53] the seven stellar spirits Taasu, who aid Thoth in his calculations as to the universe.[54] 'None other in the assembly of the gods resembleth him' [Ra, the sun-god] says an Egyptian hymn.[55] The Homeric Boulē, or court, of Zeus, meeting on Olympos, and the *concilium deorum* which Jupiter convened in the palace of the skies at critical junctures,[56] will occur to everyone. In the Teutonic *Völuspa* similarly 'the most high gods take counsel together' when they arrange the movements of the heavenly bodies (De la Saussaye, *Teut. Rel.*, 343).

A. SMYTHE PALMER.

[52] See Malan, *Book of Adam and Eve*, p. 226. The influence of the stars was due to the divinities or angels (*Elohim*), who resided in them. 'The Heavens appeared in seven circles and gods in their stellar forms, and the constellations were severally enumerated with the gods in them.'—*Hermes Trismegistus, Poemandres*, iii. (27, ed. Chambers). According to Maimonides, the universe was developed by the influence of the spheres, which are intellects (*Guide to Perplexed*, ed. Friedländer, i. lxvii.).

[53] *Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.* xxiii. 174. [54] *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.* viii. 210.

[55] Brugsch, *Oase el Khargeh*, 53.

[56] Ovid, *Met.* i. 167–76.

It is noticeable that Plato sets forth clearly the essential difference between the One, eternal, true God and the subordinate deities, intermediate between Himself and men, who are His assistants in the work of creation (*Timæus*, 28, 34, etc.; Akerman, *The Christian Element in Plato*, 48). With the heavenly archetypes of Plato, of which earthly things are copies (Gompertz, *Greek Thinkers*, iii. 1), an idea found also among uncivilised races (Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, ii. 243), we may compare the Babylonian conception that a Divine image is the counterpart of something heavenly:

> In heaven he is made, on earth he is made,
> This symbol among the hosts of heaven and earth is made.
> —C. J. Ball, *Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.* xiv. 160.

> What time the World's great Workmaister did cast
> To make al things such as we now behold,
> It seemes that He before His eyes had plast
> A goodly Paterne, to whose perfect mould
> He fashiond them as comely as He could.
> —Spenser, *Hymn in Honour of Beautie.*

> At his birth the heavenly council paused
> And then at last cry'd out, This is a man.
> —Fielding, *Works* (1841), 874

RELIGION AND THE CHILD

It is a fact as strange as it is unfortunate that the much-debated question of the religious education of children is usually considered almost exclusively from the points of view of the sectarian and the secularist. In a discussion of this question we are almost certain to be invited to take part in an unedifying wrangle between Church and Chapel, or between religion and secularism. That is the strange part of it, that it should seem impossible to get away from this sectarian dispute as to the abstract claims of varying religious bodies. The unfortunate part of it is that in this quarrel the interests of the child, which ought to be of the very first importance in the question, and even the interests of religion—which may or may not be of importance, according to the point of view—are alike disregarded.

If we really desire to reach a sound conclusion on a matter which is unquestionably of great moment, both for the child and for the community of which he will one day become a citizen, we must resolutely put into the background, as of secondary importance, the cries of contending sects, religious or irreligious. The first place here belongs to the psychologist who is building up the already extensive edifice of knowledge concerning the real nature of the child and the contents and growth of the youthful mind, and to the practical teacher who is in touch with that knowledge and can bring it to the test of actual experience.

The mind of the child is at once logical and extravagant, matter of fact and poetic or rather myth-making. This combination of apparent opposites, though it often seems to be almost incomprehensible to the adult, is the inevitable outcome of the fact that the child's dawning intelligence is working, as it were, in a vacuum. In other words, the child has not acquired the two endowments which chiefly give character to the whole body of the adult's beliefs and feelings. He is without the pubertal expansion which fills out the mind with new personal and altruistic impulses, and transforms it with emotion that is often dazzling and sometimes distorting; and he has not yet absorbed, or even gained the power of absorbing, all those beliefs, opinions and mental attitudes which the race has slowly acquired and transmitted as the outcome of its experiences.

The intellectual processes of children, the attitude and contents of the child's mind, have been explored during recent years with a care and detail that have never been brought to that study before. This is not a matter of which the adult can be said to possess any instinctive or matter-of-course knowledge. Adults usually have a strange aptitude to forget entirely the facts of their lives as children, and children are usually, like peoples of primitive race, very cautious in the deliberate communication of their mental operations, their emotions, and their ideas. Thus we forget that the child is equally without the internally acquired complex emotional nature which has its kernel in the sexual impulse, and without the externally acquired mental equipment which may be summed up in the word tradition. But he possesses the vivid activities founded on the exercise of his senses and appetites, and he is able to reason with a relentless severity from which the traditionalised and complexly emotional adult shrinks back with horror. The child creates the world for himself, and he creates it in his own image and the images of the persons he is familiar with. Nothing is sacred to him, and he pushes to the most daring extremities—as it seems to the adult—the arguments derived from his own personal experiences. He is unable to see any distinction between the natural and the supernatural, and he is justified in this conviction because, as a matter of fact, he himself lives in what for most adults would be a supernatural atmosphere; most children see visions with closed, and sometimes with open eyes, they are not unfrequently subject to colour-hearing and other synæsthetic sensations, and they occasionally hear hallucinatory voices; it is possible, indeed, that this is the case with nearly all children in some slight degree, although the faculty dies out early, and is easily forgotten because its extraordinary character was never recognised.

Of forty-eight children, says Stanley Hall, twenty believed the sun, moon, and stars to live, sixteen thought flowers could feel, and fifteen that dolls would feel pain if burnt. The sky was found the chief field in which the children exercised their philosophic minds. About three quarters of them thought the world a plain with the sky like a bowl turned over it, sometimes believing that it was of such thin texture that one could easily break through, though so large that much floor-sweeping was necessary in Heaven. The sun may enter the ground when it sets, but half the children thought that at night it rolls or flies away, or is blown, or walks, or God pulls it higher up out of sight, taking it up into Heaven, according to some, putting it to bed, and even taking off its clothes and putting them on again in the morning, or again, it is believed to lie under the trees at night and the angels mind it. God, of whom children always hear so much, plays a very large part in these conceptions, and is made directly responsible for all cosmic phenomena. Thus thunder to these American

children was God groaning or kicking, or rolling barrels about, or turning a big handle, or grinding snow, or breaking something, or rattling a big hammer, while the lightning is due to God putting his finger out, or turning the gas on quick, or striking matches, or setting paper on fire. According to Boston children, God is a big, perhaps a blue man, to be seen in the sky, on the clouds, in church, or even in the streets. They declare that God comes to see them sometimes, and they have seen him enter the gate. He makes lamps, babies, dogs, trees, money, &c., and the angels work for him. He looks like a priest, or a teacher, or papa, and the children like to look at him; a few would themselves like to be God. His house in the sky may be made of stone or brick; birds, children, and Santa Claus live with God.

Birds and beasts, their food and their furniture, as Burnham points out, all talk to children; when the dew is on the grass 'the grass is crying,' the stars are candles or lamps, perhaps cinders from God's stove, butterflies are flying pansies, icicles are Christmas candy. Children have imaginary play-brothers and sisters and friends, with whom they talk. Sometimes God talks with them. Even the prosiest things are vivified; the tracks of dirty feet on the floor are flowers; a creaking chair talks; the shoemaker's nails are children whom he is driving to school.

Miss Miriam Levy once investigated the opinions of 560 children, boys and girls, between the ages of four and fourteen, as to how the man in the moon got there. Only five were unable to offer a serious explanation; forty-eight thought there was no man there at all; fifty offered a scientific explanation of the phenomenon; but all the rest, the great majority, presented imaginative solutions which could be grouped into seventeen different classes.

Such facts as these—which can easily be multiplied and are indeed familiar to all though their significance is not usually realised—indicate the special tendencies of the child in the religious sphere. He is unable to follow the distinctions which the adult is pleased to make between 'real,' 'spiritual,' and 'imaginary' beings. To him such distinctions do not exist. He may, if he so pleases, adopt the names, or such characteristics as he chooses, of the beings he is told about, but he puts them into his own world, on a footing of more or less equality, and he decides himself what their fate is to be. The adult's supreme beings by no means always survive in the struggle for existence which takes place in the child's imaginative world. It was found among many thousand children entering the city schools of Berlin that Red Riding Hood was better known than God, and Cinderella than Christ. That is the result of the child's freedom from the burden of tradition.

Yet at the same time the opposite though allied peculiarity of childhood—the absence of the emotional developments of puberty,

which deepen and often cloud the mind a few years later—is also making itself felt. Extravagant as his beliefs may appear, the child is an uncompromising rationalist and realist. His supposed imaginativeness is indeed merely the result of his logical insistence that all the new phenomena presented to him shall be thought of in terms of himself and his own environment. His wildest notions are based on precise, concrete, and personal facts of his own experience. That is why he is so keen a questioner of grown-up people's ideas, and a critic who may sometimes be as dangerous and destructive as Bishop Colenso's Zulus. Most children, before the age of thirteen, as Earl Barnes states, are inquirers, if not sceptics.

If we clearly realise these characteristics of the childish mind, we cannot fail to understand the impression made on it by religious instruction. The statements and stories that are repeated to him are easily accepted by the child in so far, and in so far only, as they answer to his needs, and when accepted they are assimilated, which means that they are compelled to obey the laws of his own mental world. In so far as the statements and stories presented to him are not acceptable or cannot be assimilated, it happens either that they pass by him unnoticed, or else that he subjects them to a cold and matter-of-fact logic which exerts a dissolving influence upon them.

Now a few of the ideas of religion are assimilable by the child, and notably the idea of a God as the direct agent in cosmic phenomena; some of the childish notions I have quoted illustrate the facility with which the child adopts this idea. He adopts, that is, what may be called the hard precise skeleton of the idea, and imagines a colossal magician, of anthropomorphic (if not paidomorphic) nature, whose operations are curious, though they usually fail to arouse any mysterious reverence or awe for the agent. But for the most part the ideas of religion cannot be accepted or assimilated by children; they were not made by children or for children, but represent the feelings, thoughts, and experiences of men, and sometimes even of very exceptional and abnormal men. The child who grows devout and becomes anxious about the state of his soul is a morbid and unwholesome child; if he prefers praying for the conversion of his play-fellows to joining them in their games, he is not so much an example of piety as a pathological case whose future must be viewed with anxiety; and to preach religious duties to children is exactly the same, it has been well said, as to exhort them to imagine themselves married people, and to inculcate on them the duties of that relation. Fortunately the normal child is usually able to resist these influences. It is the healthy child's impulse either to let them fall with indifference or to apply to them the instrument of his unmerciful logic.

Naturally, the adult, in self-defence, is compelled to react against this indifferent or aggressive attitude of the child. He may be no

match for the child in logic, and even unspeakably shocked by his daring inquiries, like an amiable old clergyman I knew when a public school teacher in Australia; he came to the school to give Bible lessons and was one day explaining how King David was a man after God's own heart, when a small voice was heard making inquiries about Uriah's wife; the small boy was hushed down by the shocked clergyman and the cause of religion was not furthered in that school. But the adult knows that he has on his side tradition which has not yet been acquired by the child and the inner emotional expansion which still remains unliberated in the child. The adult, therefore, fortified by this superiority, feels justified in falling back on the weapon of authority: 'You may not *want* to believe this or to learn it, but you've *got* to.'

It is in this way that the adult wins the battle of religious education. In the deeper and more far-seeing sense he has lost it. Religion has become, not a charming privilege, but a lesson, a lesson about unbelievable things, a meaningless task to be learnt by heart, a drudgery. It may be said that, even if that is so, religious lessons merely share the inevitable fate of all subjects which become school tasks. But that is not the case. Every other subject which is likely to become a school task is apt to become intelligible and attractive to some considerable section of the scholars because it is within the range of childish intelligence. But, for the two very definite reasons I have pointed out, this is only to an extremely limited degree true as regards the subject of religion, because the young organism is an instrument not as yet fitted with the notes which religion is most apt to strike.

Of all school subjects religion thus tends to be the least attractive. Lobsien at Kiel found, a few years since, in the course of a psychological investigation, that when 500 children, between the ages of nine and fourteen, were asked which was their favourite lesson hour, only twelve (ten girls and two boys) named the religious lesson. In other words, nearly 98 per cent. of the children (and nearly all the boys) find that religion is either an indifferent or a repugnant subject. I have no reports at hand as regards English children, but there is little reason to suppose that the result would be widely different. Here and there a specially skilful teacher might bring about a result more favourable to religious teaching, but that could only be done by depriving the subject of its most characteristic elements.

This is, however, not by any means the whole of the mischief which, from the religious point of view, is thus perpetrated. It might, on *a priori* grounds, be plausibly argued that even if there is among healthy young children a certain amount of indifference or even repugnance to religious instruction, that is of very little consequence; they cannot be too early grounded in the principles of the faith they will later be called on to profess; and however incapable they may now be of understanding the teaching that is being incul-

cated in the school, they will realise its importance when their knowledge and experience increase. But however plausible this may seem, practically it is not what usually happens. The usual effect of constantly imparting to children an instruction they are not yet ready to receive is to deaden their sensibilities to the whole subject of religion. The premature familiarity with religious influences—putting aside the rare cases where it induces a morbid preoccupation with religion—induces a reaction of routine which becomes so habitual that it successfully withstands the later influences which on more virgin soil would have evoked vigorous and living response. So far from preparing the way for a more genuine development of religious impulse later on, this precocious instruction is just adequate to act as an inoculation against deeper and more serious religious interests. The commonplace child in later life accepts the religion it has been inured to so early as part of the conventional routine of life. The more vigorous and original child for the same reason shakes it off, perhaps for ever.[1] There are few among us who have not suffered from this too early familiarity with the Bible and the conception of religion. Even for a man of really strong and independent intellect it may be many years before the precociously dulled feelings become fresh again, before the fetters of routine fall off, and he is enabled at last to approach the Bible with fresh receptivity, and to realise, for the first time in his life, the treasures of art and beauty and divine wisdom it contains. But for most that moment never comes round. For the majority the religious education of the school as effectually seals the Bible for life as the classical education of the college seals the great authors of Greece and Rome for life ; no man opens his school books again when he has once left school. Those who read Greek and Latin for love have not usually come out of universities, and there is surely a certain significance in the fact that the children of one's Secularist friends are so often found to become devout churchgoers.

At puberty everything begins to be changed. That period, really and psychologically, marks a 'new birth.' Emotions which are of fundamental importance, not only for the individual's personal life but for his social and even cosmic relationships, are for the first time born. Not only is the child's body remoulded in the form of a man or a woman but the child-soul becomes a man-soul or a woman-soul, and nothing can possibly be as it has been before.

[1] Luther, feeling the need to gain converts to Protestantism as early as possible, was a strong advocate for the religious training of children, and has doubtless had much influence in this matter on the Protestant Churches. 'The study of religion, of the Bible, and the Catechism,' says Fiedler, 'of course comes first and foremost in his scheme of instruction.' He was also quite prepared to adapt it to the childish mind. 'Let children be taught,' he writes, 'that our dear Lord sits in Heaven on a golden throne, that he has a long grey beard and a crown of gold.' But Luther quite failed to realise the inevitable psychological reaction referred to above.

The daringly sceptical logician has gone, and so has the imaginative dreamer for whom the world was the automatic magnifying mirror of his own childish form and environment. It has been revealed to him that there are independent personal and impersonal forces outside himself, forces with which he may come into a conscious and fascinatingly exciting relationship. It is a revelation of supreme importance, and with it comes not only the complexly emotional and intellectual realisation of personality, but the aptitude to enter into and assimilate the traditions of the race.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that this is the moment, and the earliest moment, when it becomes desirable to initiate the boy or girl into the mysteries of religion. That it is the best moment is indicated by the well-recognised fact that the immediately post-pubertal period of adolescence is the period during which, even spontaneously, the most marked religious phenomena tend to occur.[2] Stanley Hall seems to think that twelve is the age at which the cultivation of the religious consciousness may begin :

> the age signalised by the ancient Greeks as that at which the study of what was comprehensively called music should begin, the age at which Roman guardianship ended, at which boys are confirmed in the modern Greek, Catholic, Lutheran, and Episcopal Churches, and at which the Child Jesus entered the Temple, is as early as any child ought consciously to go about his Heavenly Father's business.

But I doubt whether we can fix the age definitely by years. It is not age with which we ought to be concerned but a biological epoch of psychic evolution. It is unwise to insist on any particular age, because development takes place within a considerably wide limit of years.

I have spoken of the introduction to religion at puberty as the initiation into a mystery. The phrase was deliberately chosen, for it seems to me to be not a metaphor but the expression of a truth which has always been understood whenever religion has been a reality and not a mere convention. Among savages in nearly all parts of the world the boy or girl at puberty is initiated into the mystery of manhood or of womanhood, into the duties and the privileges of the adult members of the tribe. The youth is taken into a solitary place for a month or more, he is made to suffer pain and hardship, to learn self-restraint, he is taught the lore of the tribe as well as the elementary rules of morality and justice; he is shown the secret things of the tribe and their meaning and significance which no stranger may know. He is, in short, enabled to find his soul, and he emerges from this discipline a trained and responsible member of his tribe. The girl receives a corresponding training, suited to her sex, also in

[2] Professor Starbuck, in his *Psychology of Religion*, has well brought together and clearly presented much of the evidence showing this intimate association between adolescence and religious manifestations.

solitude, at the hands of the older women. A clear and full description of a typical savage initiation into manhood at puberty is presented by Dr. Haddon in the fifth volume of the *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, and Dr. Haddon makes the comment: 'It is not easy to conceive of a more effectual means for a rapid training.'

The ideas of remote savages concerning the proper manner of initiating youth in the religious and other mysteries of life may seem of little practical assistance to superiorly civilised people like ourselves. But let us turn, therefore, to the Greeks. They also had preserved the idea and the practice of initiation into sacred mysteries, though in a somewhat modified form because religion had ceased to be so intimately blended with all the activities of life. The Eleusinian and other mysteries were initiations into sacred knowledge and insight which, as is now recognised, involved no revelation of obscure secrets, but were mysteries in the sense that all intimate experiences of the soul, the experiences of love quite as much as those of religion, are mysteries, not to be lightly or publicly spoken of. In that feeling the Greek was at one with the Papuan, and it is interesting to observe that the procedure of initiation into the Greek mysteries, as described by Theon of Smyrna and other writers, followed the same course as the pubertal initiations of savages; there was the same preliminary purification by water, the same element of doctrinal teaching, the same ceremonial and symbolic rubbing with sand or charcoal or clay, the same conclusion in a joyous feast, even the same custom of wearing wreaths.

In how far the Christian sacraments were consciously moulded after the model of the Greek mysteries is still a disputed point;[3] but the first Christians were also seeking spiritual initiation, and they necessarily adopted, consciously or unconsciously, methods of procedure which, in essentials, were fundamentally the same as those they were already familiar with. The early Christian Church adopted the rite of Baptism not merely as a symbol of initiation but as an actual component part of a process of initiation; the purifying ceremony was preceded by long preparation, and when at last completed the baptized were sometimes crowned with garlands. When at a later period in the history of the Church the physical part of the initiation was divorced from the spiritual part, and baptism was performed in infancy and confirmation at puberty, a fatal mistake was made, and each part of the rite largely lost its real significance.

But it still remains true that Christianity embodied in its practical system the ancient custom of initiating the young at puberty, and that the custom exists in an attenuated form in all the more ancient Christian Churches. The rite of confirmation has, however, been devitalised

[3] The varying opinions on this point have been fairly and clearly presented by Cheetham in his Hulsean lectures on the *Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*.

and its immense significance has been almost wholly lost. Instead of being regarded as a real initiation into the privileges and the responsibilities of a religious communion, of an active fellowship for the realisation of a divine life on earth, it has become a mere mechanical corollary of the precedent rite of baptism, a formal condition of participation in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. The splendid and many-sided discipline by which the child of the savage was initiated into the secrets of his own emotional nature and the sacred traditions of his people has been degraded into the learning of a catechism and a few hours' perfunctory instruction in the schoolroom or in the parlour of the curate's lodgings. The vital kernel of the rite is decayed and only the dead shell is left, while some of the Christian Churches have lost even the shell.

It is extremely probable that in no remote future the State in England will reject as insoluble the problem of imparting religious instruction to the young in its schools. The support which the newly established Secular Education League has found in the most various quarters is without doubt a fact of impressive significance. It is well known also that the working classes—the people chiefly concerned in the matter—are distinctly opposed to religious teaching in State schools. It is now recognised that in rejecting the attempt of the present Government to perpetuate religious instruction in schools, the House of Lords—however unwise its action may have been from other points of view—correctly voiced the opinion of the masses. There can be little doubt that before many years have passed, in England as elsewhere, the Churches will have to face the question of the best methods of themselves undertaking that task of religious training which they have sought to foist upon the State. If they are to fulfil this duty in a wise and effectual manner they must follow the guidance of biological psychology at the point where it is at one with the teaching of their own most ancient traditions, and develop the merely formal rite of confirmation into a true initiation of the new-born soul at puberty into the deepest secrets of life and the highest mysteries of religion.

It may possibly be said by those among us who are nowadays eager to 'think Imperially' that to take up the position here adopted is to subordinate psychology to the interests of the Christian religion; that we live in an Empire in which there are 337 millions of people who are not even nominally Christians, and that even among the comparatively small number who call themselves Christians a very large proportion are practically Secularists, and a considerable number avowedly so. If, however, we assume the Secularist's position, the considerations here brought forward still retain their validity. In the first place, the undoubtedly frequent hostility of the Freethinker to Christianity is not so much directed against vital religion as against a dead Church. The Freethinker is prepared to respect

the Christian who by free choice and the exercise of thought has attained the Christian position, but he resents the so-called Christian who is merely in the Church because he finds himself there, without any effort of his will or his intelligence. The convinced Secularist feels respect for the sincere Christian, even though it may only be in the sense that the real saint feels tenderness for the hopeless sinner. And in the second place, as I have sought to point out, the facts we are here concerned with are far too fundamental to concern the Christian alone. They equally concern the Secularist, who also is called upon to satisfy the spiritual hunger of the adolescent youth, to furnish him with a discipline for his entry into life, and a satisfying vision of the universe. And if Secularists have not always grasped this necessity, we may perhaps find therein one main reason why Secularism has not met with so enormous and enthusiastic a reception as the languor and formalism of the Churches seemed to render possible.

If the view here set forth is sound—a view more and more widely held by educationalists and by psychologists trained in biology—the first twelve years must be left untouched by all conceptions of life and the world which transcend immediate experience, for the child whose spiritual virginity has been prematurely tainted will never be able to awake afresh to the full significance of those conceptions when the age of religion at last arrives. But are we, it may be asked, to leave the child's restless, inquisitive, imaginative brain without any food during all those early years? By no means. Even admitting that, as it has been said, at the early stage religious training is the supreme art of standing out of Nature's way, it is still not hard to find what, in this matter, the way of Nature is. The life of the individual recapitulates the life of the race, and there can be no better imaginative food for the child than that which was found good in the childhood of the race. The savage sees the world almost exactly as the civilised child sees it, as the magnified image of himself and his own environment, but he sees it with an added poetic charm, a delightful and accomplished inventiveness, which the child is incapable of. The myths and legends of primitive peoples—for instance those of the British Columbian Indians, so carefully reproduced by Boas in German and Hill Tout in English—are one in their precision and their extravagance with the stories of children, but with a finer inventiveness. It was, I believe, many years ago pointed out by Ziller that fairy-tales ought to play a very important part in the education of young children, and since then B. Hartmann, Stanley Hall, and many others of the most conspicuous educational authorities have emphasised the same point. Fairy tales are but the final and transformed versions of primitive myths, creative legends, stories of old gods. In purer and less transformed versions the myths and legends of primitive peoples are often scarcely less adapted to the child's mind. Julia

Gayley argues that the legends of early Greek civilisation, the most perfect of all dreams, should above all be revealed to children. The early traditions of the East and of America yield material that is scarcely less fitted for the child's imaginative uses. Portions of the Bible, specially of Genesis, are in the strict sense fairy tales, that is legends of early gods and their deeds which have become stories. In the opinion of many these portions of the Bible may suitably be given to children (though it is curious to observe that a Welsh Education Committee has lately prohibited the reading in schools of precisely the most legendary part of Genesis) but it must always be remembered, from the Christian point of view, that nothing should be given at this early age which is to be regarded as essential at a later age, for the youth turns against the tales of his childhood as he turns against its milk-foods. Some day, perhaps, it may be thought worth while to compile a Bible for childhood, not a mere miscellaneous assortment of stories, but a collection of books as various in origin and nature as are the books of the Hebraic-Christian Bible, so that every kind of child in all his moods and stages of growth might here find fit pasture. Children would not then be left wholly to the mercy of the thin and frothy literature which the contemporary press pours upon them so copiously; they would possess at least one great and essential book which, however fantastic and extravagant it might often be, would yet have sprung from the deepest instincts of the primitive soul, and furnish answers to the most insistent demands of primitive hearts. Such a book, even when finally dropped from the youth's or girl's hands, would still leave its vague perfume behind.

It may be pointed out finally that the fact that it is impossible to teach children even the elements of adult religion and philosophy, as well as unwise to attempt it, by no means implies that all serious teaching is impossible in childhood. On the imaginative and spiritual side, it is true, the child is re-born and transformed during adolescence, but on the practical and concrete side his life and thought are for the most part but the regular and orderly development of the habits he has already acquired. The elements of ethics on the one hand, as well as of natural science on the other, may alike be taught to children, and indeed they become a necessary part of early education, if the imaginative side of training is to be duly balanced and complemented. The child as much as the adult can be taught, and is indeed apt to learn, the meaning and value of truth and honesty, of justice and pity, of kindness and courtesy; we have wrangled and worried for so long concerning the teaching of religion in schools that we have failed altogether to realise that these fundamental notions of morality are a far more essential part of school training; the Inquiry into the Methods and Results of Moral Training in Schools, now being carried out under the auspices of a large and influential Committee,

is likely, therefore, to be productive of much good in calling attention to this matter.

In the same way the child is well fitted to acquire a precise knowledge of the natural objects around him, of flowers and plants and to some extent of animals, objects which to the savage also are of absorbing interest; in this way he is not only being restrained from the caprices of imagination but is unconsciously preparing himself for the serious studies which must occupy so much of his later youth.

The child, we thus have to realise, is from the educational point of view a being of dual nature, who needs ministering to on both sides. On the one hand he demands the key to an imaginative Paradise which one day he must leave, bearing away with him, at the best, only a dim and haunting memory of its beauty. On the other hand he possesses eager aptitudes on which may be built up concrete knowledge and human relationships to serve as a firm foundation when the period of adolescent development and discipline at length arrives.

HAVELOCK ELLIS.

THE EDUCATIONAL LADDER

In education as in other things we lack courage, we shelter ourselves behind accepted axioms and shrink from acting on our convictions.

For example, the title of this article expresses the democratic and at present popular view of our educational aims.

The poorest child is to be given the means and opportunity of going to college. His brilliant talents (it is always a he and rarely a she in the elysian dreams of our county councillors) are to be detected by the village schoolmaster, signed and sealed by the inspector, encouraged by the county council scholarship and cemented by transference to a secondary school and a university career. What is to happen afterwards we seldom inquire.

I propose to examine this dream.

In ordinary life we do not live on ladders; we walk on the solid ground, and mount a ladder in exceptional cases for exceptional purposes. Not every man is expected to build or paint a house—pick from or prune our trees—we keep ladders for such occasions and use them when required.

Would to Heaven we did the same with educational ladders! Only one child in a hundred, perhaps one in a thousand, will go to the University. Why sacrifice the ninety-nine or the nine hundred and ninety-nine to him?

We are terrorised by the democratic spirit of the day, till even a democrat like myself squirms at the follies into which this theory, unbalanced and unchecked, is leading us—no, has led us—for it lies at the root of our educational system and poisons it root and branch.

What else has influenced the amazing curriculum of our elementary schools? Only the immense ignorance of the general public about that curriculum can account for the choice of subjects which are now accepted as indispensable.

Does the country gentleman, the farmer, the builder, or the carpenter appreciate the material we turn out yearly with labour certificates? Does the employer generally realise, when he complains that boys prefer to swell the ranks of underpaid clerks rather than soil their hands by learning a trade, that the previous instruction

given to all boys unfits them for learning a trade and only fits them for clerkships, scholarships, and the possible university ?

In elementary schools no subject receives more attention than English grammar. The difference between nouns and adjectives, the so-called 'training of logical faculty' supposed to accompany the analysis of sentences, results in grammar being hammered into boys and girls alike for two or three mortal hours every week every year of their school life, in nearly every school in this kingdom.

English grammar is the curse of elementary education, the despair of the teacher, the loathed lesson to the child. Quickly he learns by heart certain formulæ likely to be serviceable on the larger number of occasions, and rapidly in the presence of inspectors is such lore glibly reproduced.

How often have I myself been forced to encourage the pursuit of this abstract and detestable science !

'"My umbrella is split." Subject of the sentence, please, children ?' '"Umbrella," please, miss.'

'Quite right ; well done, Tommy. Now, "My green umbrella is split." Subject of that sentence, please, children ? "Umbrella" again—quite right—why, how clever we all are !'

'"My grandfather's green umbrella is split." Subject, please, children ?'

As sure as fate comes the reply, '"Grandfather," please, miss. 'Oh, Susan Anne ! now, do you really mean that your grandfather is split ? How many other children have split grandfathers ?' And so on, till a little mirth is introduced into the dreary world of subjects, objects, enlargements, and predicates.

Meanwhile, Tommy and Susan Anne go home to tea and neither seems much the better able to assist their mother in her housework or their father in the garden. Nor does it appear to me are they the least more likely to develop logical faculty of a practical kind enabling them to cope with draughts which cause the chimney to smoke, the making of shelves out of old boxes, or the mending of holes which stand gaping for lack of a needle and thread.

In Queen Elizabeth's reign, class legislation was openly accepted as the basis of our laws. Long before then wages were fixed in the various trades, and little boys of seven who had already embraced the occupation of husbandry were compelled to pursue that calling for life.

In remedying evils of this monstrous kind, in abolishing the maximum wage of an adult, or destroying the chains that fettered the life purpose of the infant, we swept away the invaluable and common-sense basis of which they were only an evil off-shoot. So long as the world lasts we shall have class distinctions. Why not accept them in the right spirit ?

Let us fight by all means against the snobbery which prevents one class from knowing its next-door neighbour—makes the farmer's

daughter despise her better-educated sister, the village schoolmistress, and tends to leave the poor squire's or clergyman's daughter to a life of solitude.

But accept the fact that the son of a labouring man is more likely than not to be a labouring man, the daughter more likely than not to go out to service and eventually to marry. Prepare them, therefore, for labour, service, and marriage. Let the time now wasted in grammar (and in our big town schools on French) be replaced by manual training.

A murmur of exasperation seems to reach my ears. Is Miss Bathurst mad?—does she not know that manual training centres exist in every large town, that large capitation grants are given to encourage it, that very creditable work of all kinds, both woodwork and iron work, is the result, &c.?

I know it well. I nevertheless desire to point out the necessary limitations of the present type of manual training, and I urge the rate-payer and the public to consider my point of view.

Manual training centres are luxuries and very expensive ones—they are necessarily confined to towns, generally to large towns; nothing of the kind is provided for girls, unless cookery and laundry work come under this head. By all means have these centres—long may they prosper and much may they increase!—but consider the case of the country child.

More than half the child population of this country are attending country schools—there they learn grammar. When school life is over they drift to towns and there they eventually swell the ranks of the sweated industries or join the army of anæmic clerks.

Why on earth not make some form of manual training the basis of all elementary education? Let the older boys and girls learn (*a*) carpentering; (*b*) boot-making and mending; (*c*) tailoring; (*d*) cooking; (*e*) cottage gardening, and the younger ones basket-weaving and netting.

Do not label even cookery, as is now done, with the words 'for girls,' or cottage gardening, as is now done, 'for boys.' I press the latter point for special practical reasons. Up to the age of fourteen such subjects can be shared advantageously by boys and girls alike; if a grant is only given for boys, in the small schools there will not be enough children to form a class; in the same way with girls' subjects—unless boys learn them too, the class will not be big enough to justify engaging a special teacher. If the question of sex were left entirely to the teachers a large increase in the number of schools adopting my plan would be the result.

Again I wish to point out that expensive tools and expensive apparatus are not required. I will go further and add that in many ways they are undesirable. For tailoring, a needle, thread, and scraps of cloth for patching are wanted.

As teacher, employ the village tailor, and leave off bothering about whether he has a certificate. For boot-mending, again, take the village cobbler. (At the village of Holton, near Oxford, cobbling has been successfully introduced for the past three years—details could be had on application to the Secretary of the Oxon County Council, Education Committee.) For cookery, hire a common kitchen for 2*s.* 6*d.* a week—have an inconvenient stove and a scarcity of utensils. Many a squire's or clergyman's wife will gladly allow her cook or kitchen-maid to teach, one afternoon per week.

Cottage gardening is already encouraged and certificates are not enforced from its teachers; but, as I have explained, small schools often neglect the subject because of the difficulty of leaving the girls while teaching the boys, where only one teacher is available, and this is the more to be deplored inasmuch as gardening is a most healthy exercise for the girls, who rarely get as much fresh air as they require.

Carpentering contains more opportunities for 'developing faculty' than perhaps any other trade. The eye must be quick and exact, the hand obedient, the mind careful in calculation, and many women in after life would find a little knowledge in this direction most valuable when they had a home of their own.

I would fain see every afternoon spent in manual training—cookery is rather hot work in the summer; cottage gardening is impossible in the winter. If, however, the five subjects I have given were parcelled out throughout the year and *all* children spent all their afternoons in practical work, while all teachers got the immense help of assistance from local sources, the whole attitude of the farmer and mechanic towards elementary education would undergo a revolution.

One cannot but wish that the clergy had shown as much interest in getting a practical curriculum as they have shown in enforcing a doctrinal catechism. Country children would then ere this have been let loose on the world fitted to live in and enjoy it.

Finally, I would again revert to the question of economy. It is of no use insisting on expensive apparatus which children will never see again. The clasp knife, the sixpenny tool, the common vegetable must be utilised—moreover, these things supply employment in the home, and would be very popular.

Inspectors will be required with some knowledge of these subjects, but if once the idea were accepted many ladies from Swanley College would add a knowledge of cookery &c. to their other accomplishments, and in my opinion women are better fitted than men to superintend education which perforce ceases at fourteen years of age.

P.S.—For the child who thrives on grammar there will remain the 'university.'

KATHARINE BATHURST,
Late Inspector of Schools.

THE FEMALE PRISONER

'Regia, crede mihi, res est succurrere lapsis.'—OVID.

THERE is hardly a public event of importance which does not make its influence felt in the recesses of the prison-house.

It is astonishing how much not only of the main thoroughfares, but of the byways of human life, is witnessed in a walk along the corridors of one of our great London prisons. The wash of the passing craft throws into the backwater of the gaol the flotsam and jetsam of human failure, but it also draws attention to the great stream of life outside which more or less gave them being. Who would surmise that the assembling of Parliament could in any way affect the female population of the prison? It is easily explained. When our legislators come together, they bring in their train their families and households. Their domestic linen goes to the wash, and trade in the laundries becomes brisk. Good wages are earned, money is plentiful, but, alas! in many instances the swollen purse is dissolved in beer and spirits, and its owner eventually finds her way to the police-station and to the prison-cell.

Nowhere, says the Rev. G. P. Merrick in his *Work among the Fallen*, can you obtain a more extensive view of the world of human nature than within the walls of a large prison. All sorts and conditions of men and women pass in there, and open up to view numerous phases of life and character of which people at large are unaware. The world looks upon the stage-front of its theatre, and knows little or nothing of what is going on behind the scenes. It sees the actors of the play and their drama, and, without much thought, says that the spectacle is offensive. It gives way to disgust and despair, closes its heart against reformatory effort, and cries out in accents of abandoned hope, 'Who will show us any good?'

All our prisons are conducted on the 'silent system'; that is to say, no talking is allowed, unless in special circumstances. It is not easy to make female prisoners conform strictly to this rule, or, as some spiteful authority has said, 'to any rules whatever.' Women in prison are often restless and excitable, and their charge is far from an easy one to those to whom the duty is confided. New rules and different treatment have brought about a great improvement in these

respects, and an infraction of prison discipline is now infinitely more rare than it was thirty years ago. In 1878 the number of refractory women amounted to 7,119. Last year the list of female delinquents comprised only 1,999 names, though the prison population had increased by many thousands.

It is, to be sure, a recognised fact that the women give more trouble than the men, yet under a wise and efficacious system they can be just as easily disciplined. The means employed are of necessity different, but the same general principles determine the control of both sexes. The whole secret lies in the training of the officers, and in the amount of intelligence and force of character that they bring to bear upon their work. It is a fallacy to suppose that women cannot be subjected to order and discipline. On the contrary, they fall into habits of cleanliness and neatness much more readily than do men; and by tact and patience they can be induced to conform to prudent and wholesome regulations. There are always, of course, certain 'irreconcilables' who rebel against control of any kind. It is for this fraction that strict rules must be framed and measures taken to ensure the peace and quiet of the whole establishment.

To secure the tranquillity of the main body—and it is not every female offender who is for kicking up a dust—it is at all times necessary to maintain control over, and perhaps to isolate, an ill-disposed, recalcitrant half-dozen.

When a woman smashes the windows at a railway station because she has missed her train, it is reasonable to suppose that her temper is not easily governed even in the prison-cell.

Much of the deliberate misbehaviour of such prisoners proceeds from vanity and the desire to win notoriety. Even in the motley company that assembles in a prison-yard they want to pose as 'heroines.'

In olden days a woman who, in prison parlance, 'broke out' and was refractory very soon found herself in a dark cell. No ray of light entered it, and the offender was not allowed to come out until she had purged her contempt. As a rule this method of correcting a bad prisoner had but little effect, except, perhaps, in making the woman more than ever hardened, sullen and fiendish. In none of the English prisons nowadays are there any such relics of the barbarous system of a bygone time. The abolition of the dark cell in no way affected the good order and discipline which should prevail in a well-conducted prison.

Statistics drawn up some few years ago show that about half the number of women who go astray in London are born in the Metropolis, and about half come from the country. The county which sends most women from the provinces to London is Devonshire. Cheshire is the county which is least generous in that way. Of towns, those which are the centres of military, naval, or shipping interests contribute most to the female contingent within the walls of London prisons.

The London County Council and other bodies have done much to improve the immediate surroundings of the poor. When it is remembered that in the neighbourhood of the Strand there were twenty men, women and children living in four small rooms in one house, thirty-two in seven rooms in another, twenty-eight in four rooms next door, and thirty-five in seven rooms across the way, it cannot be wondered at that under such conditions human fungus of all kinds grew apace. Here is a specimen of such human fungus.

The mother of seven children is undergoing a term of eighteen months' imprisonment, and her husband is serving a term of five years in a convict prison. Her father is also undergoing a term of five years' penal servitude, and her mother has just been sentenced to six months' hard labour. Her brother is awaiting trial at Manchester, and her sister is 'wanted' by the police. It is a well-known fact that for the last eighty years one particular family has never been without a representative in prison.

The Rev. Canon Horsley, in his interesting and instructive *Prison and Prisoners*, states that 85 per cent. of juvenile offenders are boys, and he thinks that the accident and attributes of sex are the determining factors which make it five or six times more likely that a boy will commit an offence than that a girl will do so.

It must also be remembered that women are punished more lightly than men for a similar offence, that the public and police are less disposed to charge them, and that their home life shields them from many temptations to which men are subject.

When the conditions of life are more alike, as when men and women work together in mills and factories, the proportion of female offenders is much higher. For instance, Surrey sends three where Manchester sends ten women to gaol.

Canon Horsley has given some interesting figures on this point, which show that on a certain date there were undergoing a term of

	Men	Women
15 years' penal servitude	4	1
14 " " "	1	—
12 " " "	8	1
10 " " "	13	—
8 " " "	9	1
7 " " "	76	4
6 " " "	15	3
5 " " "	203	5
4 " " "	55	2
3 " " "	380	34

When a girl gets into the habit of wrong-doing it clings to her, and is thrown off with much greater difficulty than is the case with boys. Both industrial schools and reformatories show a larger percentage

of failures among girls than among boys. The percentage of incorrigibles among women also is much higher than among men.

It is probable that as women come more into line with men in their occupations, in their struggles for existence, in their independence, and the like, they will suffer as men do, and exhibit similar signs of degeneracy and an equal tendency to criminality.

Maternity is undoubtedly the greatest check upon criminality in women. The proportion of young mothers in the ranks of criminals is very small. Even among men marriage is a considerable deterrent from criminal courses; but among women motherhood is a barrier of the first importance, and its influence the greatest that is known. Not only are young married women little prone to crime, but, as Bertillon points out, the married offenders who have children are fewer in number than those who have none.

Certain great barriers, partly natural, partly artificial, have always and everywhere served to protect women from criminality. This is, perhaps, somewhat difficult of proof, because women cannot be placed exactly under the conditions which control men, and be practically unsexed. There seems to be no doubt that women's usual environment shelters them from many and various evil tendencies which are the undoing of men.

The conservative disposition of women is remarked the world over, and, being more domestic and sedentary in their habits, they are less exposed than men to the varying and disturbing influence of ordinary life.

Universal history shows us that in the ranks of the really great criminals there have been very few women. It shows us also, and not less plainly, that from the earliest days women have been liable to err in matters of morality.

It must not be forgotten, however, that, as they are so often allowed by one means or another to escape imprisonment, the actual criminality of women cannot be properly recorded. When theft is wanting it is difficult to detect them in immoral or open disorderly conduct.

Though the majority of female offenders are led into crime either by the suggestions of a third person or by an irresistible impulse, yet there are some few whose criminal propensities surpass those of the opposite sex—and, as we know, 'a bad woman is the worst of all creations.'

The ways of women in wrong-doing are not remarkable for novelty or versatility. Women seldom initiate crime or suggest or adopt new criminal methods. In these respects the female wrong-doer differs very much from the male offender, both in the matter and the manner of the offence.

Criminals boast that they make a lot of money, and it is certainly astonishing to what a figure their depredations run. But it is far

more surprising how soon they lose it again, and how little enjoyment it has afforded them. Their 'ill-gotten gains' seem to benefit no one, and they themselves are nearly always in a state of poverty, poorly dressed, and poorly sheltered.

Mr. Merrick mentions that, out of some 20,038 cases whose particulars he had gathered, 8,098 had had little or no parental care, and he sorrowfully wonders how far the absence of home ties and influences was responsible for the drifting of these human barques from their natural moorings down the river of life to destruction.

The Rev. Canon Horsley, in the work already cited, observes that he rarely found that poverty was the cause of crime, with the young or with the old. 'Innate disposition, parental example, social surroundings, social habits, the presence of temptation and the opportunity—these are the great and abiding factors. Where there is least pauperism there is most crime, and *vice versa*.'

Mr. Merrick, who indirectly corroborates this statement, furnishes statistics to show that, albeit the East End of London is a vast sea of semi-poverty, it is not here that the homes of many criminals are to be found. They are to be found rather in the West End, in regions where wealth and culture have their seat and stately mansions and spacious squares give them shelter.

The employment of women, or, in fact, of any prisoners in making goods for commercial firms is condemned by some as a premium upon crime. They think it suggests to the woman who has neither work nor home that there is a place to which she can resort and secure both. They say also that it competes with honest and free labour, and is altogether a questionable expedient for reducing the cost of prison maintenance. Very rarely, however, will man or woman voluntarily seek the shelter and obloquy of imprisonment, even for the sake of a clean bed and a 'bread-and-water' diet. If, moreover, they are careless of the degradation of prison, yet the isolation from the normal world, the loss of liberty, and the separation from friends are all deterrent influences of the most important kind.

Were it not for the forfeiture of freedom the prisons would be filled and the workhouses emptied.

> Oh liberty, how sweet you are!
> You seem so near and yet so far.
> The heart for you does long again,
> But still I am myself to blame,
> For getting drunk and doing wrong
> Has brought me to this doom so long.

This expresses in the language of one of them their sentiment on the matter, and therein lies the sting of imprisonment.

After women have been three or four times in prison, it is noticeable that their subsequent convictions are more numerous than those

of men. One fact in explanation is that men receive longer sentences, and have, therefore, less time for fresh offences.

There seems little reason, sentiment apart, why a woman should receive a shorter sentence than a man for the same kind of offence. The man, being the breadwinner of the family, having heavier pecuniary burdens and greater responsibilities, is more sorely tempted to steal. When both are equally offenders, it is not quite clear why the man's punishment should be greater than the woman's, or hers less than his. A woman, it is asserted, has not the man's power of withstanding temptation. It may fairly, however, be maintained that the temptations which assail the woman are at once less numerous and less powerful than those which beset the man.

A knowledge of the presence of criminal inclinations and intentions in offenders should simplify the task of separating and segregating the habitual from the casual wrong-doer. As children give early evidence of criminal tastes, steps should be taken to place them as soon as possible under wholesome influences. The brand may thus be preserved from the burning, and reserved for better uses.

We have in the following report from a morning paper a sad corroboration of this fact. Two children—Edward, aged 10, and Mary, aged 9—were charged at Southwark Police Court with being in bad company, the object of the charge being to get them sent to an industrial school. The father was stated to be the notorious 'Jubilee Jinks,' who had undergone penal servitude and other sentences for burglary, felonies, assaults, and something not far short of cannibalism. He gained his sobriquet at the time of the Diamond Jubilee procession by wrecking a house in the line of route because his landlord wished to eject him. Two of his grown-up sons were criminals, and at that time in prison. His mistress was in gaol for keeping a disorderly house, and his stepdaughter had been convicted of a similar offence. The family were now living in two rooms; and of one of the sons, who had been charged with felony a few weeks before, it was stated that he shared the same room as his sister and step-sister.

Returns coming from Manchester show that 68 per cent. of its industrial school population had disreputable parents, and that, in addition to these, 14 per cent. were doubtful.

It is within the knowledge of many persons now living that little children have worn prison dress and undergone the rigours of prison discipline. Children of tender age, who had committed some petty theft, were punished in the company of and in the same manner as the most vicious and incorrigible offenders. Such an anomaly is no longer possible; the new century counts upon the effects of a softer, more winning, and infinitely more hopeful treatment. If children are detected, even in serious crime, they are placed with trustworthy custodians, or in Remand Homes, that they may escape the taint and

stigma of prisons. Thus, without having seen or known the lowest forms of evil, they may be won into the paths of honesty.

Juvenile offenders are mostly the offspring of unhealthy parents; the death-rate, which among normal girls is 3·9, is as high as 8·4 per thousand amongst industrial school girls. A large proportion are orphans, and statistics indicate that no fewer than thirty-nine out of a hundred girls have lost one or both parents.

When a woman has once adventured on the down track, her descent is very rapid; far more so than that of the male offender. With one previous conviction against them there were at a stated time 16,596 men and 5,396 women; but later, when the previous convictions had mounted up, the respective figures were 3,579 for men and 6,327 for women. The women had probably taken to drink.

It is a melancholy testimony to woman's proneness to settle into crime as a habit that, out of forty-four admissions into a metropolitan prison, nine only were found to have been first offenders.

But in all countries the testimony is the same, that women are less instinctively criminal than men.

In France the ratio is four men to one woman; in the United States it is twelve men to one woman. Official returns from Italy and Spain favour the woman yet more. In England, on the contrary, the proportion of criminal women is large, for the greater crimes in particular; and it is disquieting to observe that this proportion of women criminals is almost everywhere steadily increasing. The increase is well marked in England, where the progress is rapid. The growing habits of intemperance are very largely responsible. The number of women convicted for offences due in many instances to drunkenness has increased from 54,348 in 1878 to 60,211 in 1904. Of incorrigible recidivists, in Britain a very large number are women; and 40 per cent. of the women committed to prison in 1888 had been previously convicted more than twelve times. A return made at Millbank some years ago shows that no fewer than 105 women in the prison at that date had had more than forty previous convictions. Even among the juvenile offenders charged as incorrigibles from reformatory schools and industrial schools, it appears that the proportion of girls is double that of boys.

The opinion seems to be gaining ground that old offenders among women should be more severely sentenced. The Association of Lady Visitors of Prisons has on several occasions had its attention drawn to the futility of the short sentence for deterrent, reformatory, or any useful purpose. Many people are beginning to think that if criminals can make no proper use of the privileges of life they should be placed under perpetual care.

To many female offenders imprisonment offers no terror. The annals of the police-courts testify abundantly to this distressing fact, that hundreds of women take prison as one of the commonest incidents

of life. One woman wrote on her slate the sentiments of many of her class :

> A poor wanderer here to-day,
> Where to-morrow cannot say;
> Perhaps in gaol, for aught I know—
> Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.

They grow to be rather proud of prison, reckoning up their 'centuries' like a cricketer. Quite recently a woman 'rounded on' the officer who had credited her with forty-three convictions. 'It's more like two hundred!' said she, indignantly.

Many criminals, of both sexes, in answer to questions on the subject, have declared themselves unfit for liberty, and fit only to be altogether deprived of it. They behaved wonderfully well while in prison, even for a long course of years; but once released they went again *instanter* to the bad.

When a woman has a record of some hundreds of convictions against her; when there were in a Metropolitan prison a short time ago upwards of a hundred women who had more than forty previous convictions; when an average of fifty-seven convictions each were recorded against nineteen women transferred from one northern prison to another; when one woman has only three weeks' liberty during the year, another is sent to prison three times in one week, a third has had twenty-two convictions for one month, four for two months, several for three months, and seventy for periods of from seven to fourteen days, and when a fourth says that she has been in and out of prison for forty-seven years, there seems good reason for asking whether our so-called humane methods of dealing with habitual offenders are the best that can be devised.

Many of the female offenders are intelligent and capable persons, and for their own sakes, if not for the sake of the community at large, it is very regrettable that they cannot, or will not, devote their talents to useful and honourable employments.

One woman worked cloths most beautifully, embroidering them in various styles, and filling in the centres with verses of well-known hymns and poems. Her materials were simply linen and her own hair. Another made a doll about twelve inches high out of the paper and little bits of cloth which she picked up in the workroom. The doll was dressed in the height of fashion, pins' heads representing jewellery: a very pretty work of art. Evidences and instances of their varied abilities might be multiplied.

One woman made a wearable pair of socks out of threads of oakum. A young girl did some creditable mosaic work, which was afterwards used in one of the prison chapels. The same prisoner had quite an actor's memory, and on one occasion recited the whole of the longest chapter in St. Luke's Gospel and most of the 176 verses of the 119th

Psalm. Yet, alas! she was an incorrigible thief and immoral woman, and almost everything else that was bad.

Formerly all female prisoners, irrespective of age, were eligible for instruction in the prison school. Assembled in a large room, they were under the care of the schoolmistress for an hour and a-half twice a week. Teaching in association did not answer very well; the mistakes and failures of some set the other women laughing, and made the acquisition of knowledge on the part of the striving few a matter of difficulty and unpleasantness. School for those who wanted to improve themselves became a doubly stiff, and not very profitable, ordeal. Many of the 'pupils' merely whiled away the school hours, and copy-books were chiefly useful as furnishing leaves for clandestine correspondence.

All this is now changed—both cause and effect—and the women work quietly and separately in their cells, where there are none to hear or ridicule. They are interested in their work, and do really try to make good the deficiencies of earlier years. For two hours twice a week they are taken from their work, and instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, until they have passed the Third Standard in all three subjects. The women eligible for school are those who have not reached the Fourth Standard of the elementary code, who are under forty years of age, and whose sentence is three months or upwards.

All prisoners on reception are tested as to their scholastic attainments, and those who are found lacking in any subject are placed, if possible, on the school list.

Returns of school progress, kept with much care, are in all respects satisfactory. The women who are eligible are passed into the school about five weeks after admission into prison, when they have reached the second stage of their imprisonment. A large number learn to write in the prison school, and send letters to their astonished and delighted friends at home. The husband of one woman was so surprised at receiving a letter from her in her own hand that he came with sceptical air to the gates, to inquire whether his wife had indeed been taught to write in prison. Learning that she had, he thanked the authorities for the great service which had been rendered to them both. Another prisoner wrote to her friends that 'prisons were some good after all, you see, as they learns you to read and write.'

All girls under sixteen, whatever their sentence or their educational qualifications, receive instruction for one hour daily; and those between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one may, at the chaplain's discretion, be handed over to the schoolmistress. Grateful letters from friends outside are received by the authorities; and a girl in prison wrote to her sweetheart: 'You will, no doubt, notice an improvement in my writing. A little schooling is one of the very few sweets of prison life.'

The report of the Commissioners of Prisons states that 10,128

prisoners were taught during the years 1902–3, and that no fewer than 6,997 passed through from one to four standards.

Women of good conduct are allowed to receive a letter, to write one in reply, and to be visited by respectable relatives once every three months. This privilege is greatly valued, and there is comparatively little attempt to abuse the conditions under which it is granted.

Not many years ago prisoners had little to read beyond a few devotional works. One of the largest prisons in London had only eleven secular books on its library shelves; and of the magistrates who were asked to subscribe 5*l.* for the purchase of some second-hand volumes, only two were in any way sympathetic. One gentleman observed that women were sent to prison to undergo punishment, and not to read books. To-day an enlightened and a generous Prison Commission furnishes every prison with an ample store of high-class books, the smallest gaol in the country having not less than two hundred and fifty excellent volumes of the most various character. Prisoners are now allowed to have in their cells four devotional and three educational books, together with a secular one from the library, which is exchanged once or twice a week according to the prisoner's class or stage.

The tastes of the prisoners are always consulted, and they may select what book they please. As a rule, they prefer the choice of the schoolmistress.

It is conceded that women are less amenable than men to the treatment and conditions of prison, and that, when there is question of punishment for breaches of the rules, account must be taken of sex. The offences of women are often due to impulse, or perhaps to a quarrel with another prisoner, with the not infrequent result of breaking windows, tearing up clothes, and creating a general disturbance. When all this is accomplished, it is not unusual to see the delinquent dissolve in tears.

The criminal is exceedingly fond of praise, and always seeking how she may in word or deed please those over her and obtain their commendation.

On one occasion, when the Empress Eugénie was visiting Woking Prison, several of the prisoners were called upon to show samples of their needlework. In a class of embroiderers special attention was drawn to the excellent flower work of a young girl undergoing a long sentence for the murder of her child. The Empress was much pleased with the successful efforts of the youthful prisoner. As the Imperial party was leaving the building, loud shouts and the sound of breaking glass were heard, and through the smashed cell window came hurtling every available article of furniture. This ebullition was caused by the wounded pride of another fellow-worker, who thought her own samples infinitely the best.

Male prisoners are more or less careless of their personal appearance; the women hardly ever forget it, and will break the rules to look smart. Even were there no regulations on the subject, the majority of women in prison would be tidy both in their persons and in their cells. Unless they have taken a step towards insanity they rarely neglect their appearance. This trait is so constant that it has called for sumptuary laws. If a woman can poise her cap coquettishly or embellish it with a frill she will never miss the chance, and her achievement sends a thrill of jealousy through the prison.

When long or deep fringes were the feminine fashion some years ago, these adornments were a cause of much trouble to the prison officials, and productive of no little envy and quarrelling among the fair and frail occupants of the cells.

In one prison, a woman who had been temporarily invested with a strait-jacket refused to see the chaplain, on the ground that it 'looked so ugly' and spoiled her.

One woman regularly powdered her face; but, having no looking-glass, she did it neither wisely nor well. She was watched, and it was found that she scratched off whiting from the walls of the cell, and applied it to the reduction of colour on her face. She posed as a lady of title, and thought the pallor appropriate to her dignity. Her example was immediately copied, and measures had to be taken for the preservation of the prison whitewash.

Many of these unhappy women bring with them into prison all their stock-in-trade—a little paint or powder—'to do themselves up with' on their release.

The women lie like the men, cause or no cause; and with the former it is often an absolutely spontaneous impulse. The habit is so deeply seated that it appears almost impossible of eradication.

When a man sees that there is nothing to be gained by a further denial of his crime he frequently makes a full confession; but, in general, it is not so with a criminal woman, even though truth might be of advantage to her. She will fabricate stories and change them with as much audacity as ingenuousness, thinking all the while that she is completely fooling the magistrate.

Strange to say, these women often reveal their crime in a perfectly spontaneous manner. They cannot resist the opportunity of a gossip, and thus give themselves away. For this reason, if not for others, old and young female offenders should be kept apart, and the certain risk of contamination and corruption reduced to a minimum. In the days when little girls were sent to prison it was found necessary to separate from the other prisoners two sisters, aged eleven and nine respectively. These little creatures were desperately inquisitive concerning the imprisonment and offences of the other and older women, and quite ready to impart a knowledge of their own practices.

The male criminal is probably aware of this propensity on the part of the criminal women of his acquaintance, and consequently slow to share his secrets with them.

Though many of the female criminals are great knaves and impudent frauds, they are hardly ever without a childish simplicity which betrays and defeats their cunning.

A family likeness seems to run among all professional thieves, men or women, in their overhanging eyebrows, deep-set eyes, and thick, sensual lips.

The women are mawkishly sentimental, and will write love letters to men whom they are doing their utmost to betray. Here is a specimen of the sentimentality of one who was a young unmarried mother, a prostitute, shoplifter, and a coiner.

Recitation

THE HUSBAND'S FAREWELL

Composed in H.M.P.

I.

At a Sessions House in London
Stood a young man and his wife,
Both together, waiting sentence,
To be parted young in life.
Down her cheeks the tears were streaming,
Scarce a single word they say
Until he turns around and whispers,
'Good-bye, dear, I'm called away.

II.

'Give my love unto my sister,
Ask her to look o'er my shame;
If on earth I ne'er should meet her
In Heaven we all shall meet again,
There to dwell with our dear mother
From the world of care and strife.
Entreat her to forgive her brother
The cloud he has cast o'er her life.

III.

Next the sound of wheels are heard,
The prison van has reached the door.
That wife and husband then were parted
For the term of long years four.
But she ever will prove true,
Though by all friends cast aside,
For she loves him still as dearly
As the morn she was his bride.

IV.

But it was a tearful conflict,
And a blow to that young wife
To be parted from her husband
With but twelve months' married life.

Though her hope in life is blighted,
Yet her heart within was brave,
She has left her home and kindred
Thus their harsh insults to save.

V.

She was offered a position
If she would but him forget,
But rather than accept this offer
She preferred her bread by honest sweat.
For she cherished dear her husband,
And her love turned not a shade,
But where her husband was not welcome,
She would not be welcome made.

Conclusion

They had promised at the Altar
That nought but death should those two part,
She will keep the vow she plighted,
For with her hand she gave her heart.

Finis.

This young beauty was a finished pattern of infidelity, with no suspicion of a relish for the virtues she has here so touchingly extolled.

Female prisoners often like to be under the care of a good-looking officer, and will obey her and conduct themselves properly with her, though she may be a very indifferent disciplinarian. It has been said, and often confirmed, that a plain-featured officer of unsympathetic address finds it difficult to discipline her charges.

Another form of sentimentality is the hankering to write love letters to each other. Raid the women's cells and you may make a haul of a bundle of effusive love letters which have passed surreptitiously from one prisoner to another. They are exceedingly jealous of their favourites, and will quarrel fiercely over them.

As a rule, criminals will neither look straight at nor receive the gaze of a person speaking to them. They seem to fear that their eyes will betray them. Put a question to them, and their eyes at once seek their feet, the floor, anything rather than the face of their interlocutor. The hardened old stagers will cast sharp and furtive side-glances at their questioners.

Their craftiness is great. Female criminals try to assume the character that they think will please. They pose not as what they are, but as an image of that which they conceive to be in the mind of the person who is speaking to them. They often represent themselves as the victims of fate, unable to help themselves. A prostitute, defending her course of life to the chaplain, observed complacently that the Bible spoke of a certain class of women who earned their living as she did hers, that there had always been such a class, and that she was one of them. 'Therefore,' she added, 'there is nothing further to be said about it.'

Instability of character is one of the features observable in female criminals. Simple folk possess stability and are controlled by it. It keeps them honest, of good report, and the like; it holds them in the straight path.

It is very doubtful whether criminals suffer much from remorse; the absence of this passion is very marked among them. At times they show traces of it, but such traces are feeble, suggesting an imperfect growth. Religious influences, which are the greatest known, seem sometimes to arouse a latent sense of remorse, but the feeling has then to be nursed and stimulated lest it vanish.

Acts of kindness are not unknown; they are, however, spasmodic and transient, and are often succeeded by bursts of anger and violence.

Criminals are curiously humble and penitent when contrasting the respectability of their relatives or children with their own abasement. They praise their children who have not followed in the parents' steps; when they speak of themselves they use none but the harshest words. They little know that the more derogatory they are in this respect, the more do they exhibit their true and common character.

Female criminals are not always wanting in religious feeling; they say their prayers and make use of devotional books. Their behaviour in chapel is nearly always reverent and attentive. They sing, respond, follow the order of service, and appear to be deeply interested in that which is said and done; but their religious emotions quickly subside, and they often return to their cells to indulge in the most violent temper. Though there may be some genuineness, there is no depth in their feeling.

Greed and avarice are not infrequently the causes of crime in women. Men will instigate and commit crimes in order to obtain valuables, but the motive is generally that of avarice only. A list of articles found in a room occupied by a female shoplifter in the West End of London furnishes a fair example of the cupidity of the criminal woman:

A Shoplifter's Booty.

2 boxes (wood)
1 brown silk skirt
1 water silk skirt
1 long ribbed silk jacket
1 black silk cape
1 long silk jacket (fur trimming)
1 cashmere dolman
1 small silk cape
6 pairs of socks and one of child's socks
2 table-covers
2 ladies' nightdresses
8 ladies' pocket-handkerchiefs
1 pair of child's boots
2 large pieces of satin
2 pieces of velvet
1 piece of dress stuff
5 handbags
4 purses
1 ink-box
5 brushes (2 hair, 2 hat, 1 cloth)
1 satchel

1 necklet (common)
1 pair of bracelets (common)
1 bone penholder and pencil
1 writing-desk (broken)
1 small wooden box
2 pocket-books
1 leather case
half a pound of tea
1 box containing 4 small feathers
6 pieces of lace
7 ostrich feathers
4 bonnets
1 drab silk skirt and body
1 blue and black princess robe
1 child's silk dress
1 heavy flowered silk cloak
1 lady's macintosh
1 Paisley shawl
1 silk dolman
14 pairs and 1 lady's stockings
17 ladies' collars
1 tablecloth
2 parasols
15 silk handkerchiefs
1 pair of curtains
8 small pieces of satin (various)
About 20 yards of green trimming
18 lamp-mats (various)
3 bags (one American cloth out of repair, 1 canvas)
1 pin (hat)
3 common studs
1 card-case
1 box and set of chess
1 long chain (common)
2 pencil-cases and 2 watchkeys
1 pair of ivory solitaires
2 jewel-cases
1 snuff-spoon
1 rail cleaner (minus handle)
1 victorine
2 pounds of sugar
1 looking-glass in case
1 black velvet bow
1 piece of red curtain
1 tin hatbox
2 fur caps
1 black silk dress (worn)
1 Russell cord silk skirt
1 brocade silk jacket
1 blue waterproof
1 fur tippet (torn)
1 black lace shawl
1 flannel petticoat
6 pairs of men's socks
7 pairs of gloves
2 sheets
1 pair of lady's corsets
1 fan
4 pieces of chintz
4 small pieces of silk
1 green tassel
About 8 yards of ribbon (in two pieces)
1 cigarette-case
A quantity of flossy trimming
1 plated butter-dish
3 brooches
14 pawntickets
1 pair of steel eyeglasses
1 tin box containing pins
1 woollen mat
½ pound of currants
4 ladies' silk ties
2 bibs
10 pieces of tape
3 ladies' nets
6*s.*6*d.* in silver and 2½*d.* in bronze
Several letters and a marriage certificate

But female as well as male criminals are often specialists in their crimes. They pride themselves on their specialities and on their superiority to other rogues. Their own particular 'line' they regard as a credit to them, and in no way deserving of the punishment it receives. One woman represented herself as 'never doing harm

to anybody in prison or out of prison; except, perhaps, that she took a little money or something from a gentleman's waistcoat when she was out of work or a little hard up.' With a toss of the head, the thieves say they do not 'go on the streets' or drink; 'unfortunates' that they do not steal; and coiners that they do not condescend to anything of either kind. All round there is a raising of the hands in horror at other women's offences.

One woman had conviction after conviction for stealing men's trousers; another had eleven different imprisonments for stealing legs of pork; another spent her time in lightening the pockets of people travelling in omnibuses and in underground trains; one always stole boots; another was a robber of furnished lodgings and a house-breaker in a small way; this one could never pass a bookstall without relieving it of some of its contents; this other made a point of 'keeping her hand in' wherever she went, in shop, market-place, or railway station.

Over and over again it has been remarked that when once a woman becomes, for instance, a maker or utterer of base coin she sticks to that department. Many a thief, too, has said that she could not resist the impulse to steal, that the only remedy for the matter was either to remove the opportunity from her or to remove her from the opportunity.

Shoplifting, it may be noted, is a very common form of feminine criminality. The woman sees before her a far greater number of articles than she can purchase; her cupidity is aroused, and she steals. Lombroso says that at the Bon Marché it was found that 25 per cent. of the thieves were born thieves, who robbed whenever they could; 25 per cent. were induced to steal by want; and the remainder, some of whom were in an easy position, could not resist the temptation.

The services of women are greatly in request for the purpose of passing bad money. That this form of defrauding the public treasury is a profitable one may be surmised from the fact that bad half-crowns are produced by the coiner at 3½*d.* or 4*d.* apiece, and that on every such coin she succeeds in passing he makes upwards of 2*s.*

The female criminal has a fondness for tattoo-marks, which are generally worn on her arms. Unlike the tattooing which male criminals affect, the devices are innocent enough, consisting mostly of crosses and crowns, love symbols, names or initials, and perhaps a date or two. It is somewhat different with prostitutes, especially with those of the lower class, whose arms and other parts of the body are often tattooed with names, mottoes, initials, hearts, men's heads, and even with more elaborate designs. Investigation has proved to Lombroso that, as a rule, the most tattooed are the most degraded. Though love is the subject-matter of the majority of female tattooings, yet the tattoo-mark is no guarantee of constancy. Some of the fickle

fair have had tattooed on their arms the names or initials not of two but of five or six lovers; a sense of humour, more or less unconscious, lurks in the funeral cross placed over the name or initial of some former and discarded lover.

The hair and eyes of female criminals are usually darker than those of honest women. Lombroso says that the hair of such women becomes grey very early, but that they are seldom bald.

It is generally accepted that habitual criminals present greater physical anomalies than the rest of the world. There is almost always something peculiar in their eyes, ears or noses—in the length of their arms and the thickness of their legs—in the masculine character of the women and the feminine features of the men—in the childishness of both sexes. They are all alike in their morbidity, moral insensibility, instability, irritability, and revengefulness, and partake somewhat of the nature of a lunatic and somewhat of that of a savage.

When women are disposed to crime it is frequently observed that they have in many respects a strong physical resemblance to men. Mr. Havelock Ellis mentions a case of a celebrated murderess, who, dressed like a man, enjoyed wrestling with a man, and used as her favourite weapon a hammer. . . .

Nearly all the indications of degeneracy in a woman are to be found in those features in which she resembles a man rather than one of her own sex. If the female criminal is an educated person, her handwriting favours the male.

A woman passed as a man, and acted for ten years as porter in a workhouse. Another woman, well known in London prisons, worked when at liberty either as a sailor or as a miner, and when dressed as a labouring man looked exactly what she professed to be.

A woman who assumed the name of Charles Miller was taken to the police-court in men's clothes. She had dressed in male garb for five years, and during that time had maintained the secret of her sex under most extraordinary circumstances. A woman passed as her wife, and there was no suspicion that Miller was not a man and the husband of the woman with whom she lived, and whom she supported. She worked at odd jobs about town, and was regarded as a steady, sober, and an industrious person. After this the pair took situations with a farmer in the country, the wife doing the house work, and Miller ploughing, harvesting, attending stock, and acting with the men as a farm labourer, both in summer and winter. They adopted in legal form a little Swedish child. During their residence in the country, the proceeds of several robberies having been traced to them and found on their premises, they hired a horse and vehicle and started for an outing, from which they did not return. After a long search they were captured and brought back to Chicago. The gaol was crowded, and Miller occupied a bed with a man, who had not the faintest suspicion of his companion's sex.

Criminal women are often left-handed, and this is particularly the case with pickpockets, whose depredations are mostly conducted with the left hand, the right hand covering the operation. Among ordinary women left-handedness is rare, but among criminal women it is very common.

General testimony says that prostitutes are very insensible to pain, a fact to be surmised from the readiness with which they allow themselves to be wounded, to be cauterized for certain diseases, and to undergo surgical operations.

The voices of prostitutes are very frequently deep and coarse, especially among women who come from the lowest classes and have passed perhaps their twenty-fifth year. The possession of a deep and coarse voice by one of these women in a London prison made her the butt of the other prisoners, who insisted that she must or ought to be a man.

As ordinary women live to a greater age than men, so is it found in the ranks of criminals that the female delinquent outlives the male. This, however, is not the case with prostitutes, who from a variety of causes have a short and rapid career. Their extremely irregular life, exposure to all kinds of weather, intemperate habits, eating to repletion at one time and starving at another, sensual excitement, the drain upon their system and ailments consequent upon their promiscuous intercourses, all tend to undermine their constitutions and consign them to a premature grave.

Poverty, lack of employment, want, often lead a man to commit suicide; but these motives are seldom operative with women. Perhaps women show more fortitude in misery than men, and accept far more philosophically reverses and descents in social condition. Such calamities as these bend the one, but break the other. Strange to say, marriage is a more potent cause of suicide with men than with women. The causes of women's suicides are generally affairs of the heart; domestic or physical troubles seldom drive them to the grave.

When men attempt suicide they generally mean it, and take adequate steps; and it is not often that they fail. With women it is otherwise. Either their courage ebbs at the last, or the act has never been seriously contemplated. A woman was well known to the London police-courts who had for years taken poison, hailed a cab, and then preyed on the benevolence of those who had had her rescued and resuscitated. When at last she did over-dose herself it could be truly said that the poor thing had died by misadventure.

The female prisoners who attempt their lives nearly always do so a moment or two before the patrolling officer comes round.

VERNON HARRIS.

PIRATE TRELAWNY

TRELAWNY was not really a pirate in the common acceptation of the term, or he would scarcely have survived to a ripe old age in a fashionable quarter of London; it was merely the name by which he was known among his friends and acquaintances of the middle of the last century, though it fitted him to a nicety.

After years of astonishing adventures among Malays, Arabs, and varieties of savage islanders in the Eastern Ocean, followed up, *longo intervallo*, by an intimacy in Italy with Byron and Shelley, all too speedily severed by their early death, he threw in his lot with an ambitious chieftain of the revolution in Greece, where he narrowly escaped assassination.

When finally he returned to England, the Pirate displayed an excellent taste in the choice of his place of residence, for in the forties, before it was cut up with broad gravelled roads in every direction, and the scorcher and motor-fiend were unknown, Wimbledon Common must have afforded a grateful imitation of wildness and solitude, and in those days he was living on Putney Hill.

Then some years later he bought a country-place on the Sussex coast and a house in Pelham Crescent, which in the seventies was just on the outskirts of town, and beyond it open spaces of garden and field, with only a fringe of houses along the main roads. Old Chelsea was resting in a condition of picturesque decrepitude, and along the Fulham Road, after you had passed the church at Walham Green, where Jenny Lind used to sing, you might walk on a May morning between hedges of whitethorn to the sleepy old village of Fulham and ferry across the river into the open country.

South Kensington was then a pleasant enough borderland, and peacocks' feathers were only a penny apiece. So between town and country the Pirate lived out his life, and only gave up the ghost, in 1881, at the respectable age of eighty-eight years. His mother before him had, however, lived to be ninety-three, which shows how useful a thing it is, if you are greedy of long life, to have secured a mother whose capacity in that respect is reliable.

That Trelawny's career was a remarkable one is sufficiently proved by the fact that the *Dictionary of National Biography* devotes seven

solid columns to his memory, and there he is described as 'author and adventurer.' As an adventurer he was a capable representative of those old West-country men of the days of Elizabeth and the Stuarts who sailed away to the Spanish Main and harried the Spaniards, while there can be little doubt that at one time he was deeply concerned in practices of a piratical nature which are politely alluded to in the *Dictionary* as privateering.

Sharp, in his *Life of Severn*, more handsomely styles the Pirate 'that latter-day Viking,' though most likely our remote ancestors would have found some difficulty in distinguishing between the two.

Then when his adventures were over and done, he sat down to tell us just what he chose of them, omitting a great deal more that only excites our curiosity. The two accounts that he did produce establish his right to a place in every library of English classics. To the reader jaded with the monotony of what nowadays passes for romance the *Adventures of a Younger Son*, for the forcefulness of the language and the rush of the narrative, will come as water in a thirsty land, while the charm of the love-story which holds the chief place in the *Adventures* lies beyond all criticism. These were written before he was forty, and it was not until he had reached the age of sixty-six that he gave some account of his doings in Italy and Greece, now known as the *Records of Shelley, Byron, and the Author*.

The old vigour of expression is still maintained, though the style is more polished and subdued, while our interest is equally great, because the writer is dealing with men whose names were in everyone's mouth, and whose doings and surroundings are more or less familiar to us. His power in summing up a position in a few emphatic words is admirable. I have read many accounts in widely different quarters of the complex circumstances which led up to and were consequent on that startling historical episode, the battle of Navarino, but never one in which the whole situation was set out with such compact and absolute correctness as Trelawny puts it with pungent sarcasm in half a dozen lines in the *Records*.

Mr. Edward Garnett in his introduction to the *Younger Son* (ed. 1890) tells us that the sources for a memoir of Trelawny are few. That being so, the discovery of certain letters and documents which I have been fortunate enough to meet with in the course of researches into the story of Greek revolutionary times will probably be of interest, especially as they were written with no ulterior object beyond their immediate purpose, and certain of them set at rest all doubt respecting an extraordinary performance in which the Pirate was concerned, though the writer in the *Dictionary* would fain have us believe that the story is untrue, and accordingly wipes it from the slate. In addition to the intrinsic value of these fresh details of his doings, there must be many still surviving who can remember

Trelawny himself as well as others whose names I shall have occasion to mention to whom these matters will be of personal interest.

When Byron and Trelawny had set out for Greece on board the *Hercules* in July 1823, after the revolution had been raging for more than two years, they arrived at Cephalonia, one of the Ionian Islands, off the west coast, in the beginning of August, where Byron determined to stay until he could secure some clear information as to the position of affairs and decide upon the course of action that seemed to promise the best results. This delay by no means suited the impetuosity of the Pirate, who called it 'dawdling,' and forthwith set out for the mainland in company with Hamilton Browne, making his way to the seat of the Greek Government, to whom he carried letters from Lord Byron. He then crossed to Hydra, an important island off the east coast and the chief seat of Greek commercial activity, whence he despatched the deputies to England for the purpose of raising a loan; and having finished the business entrusted to him by Byron, he afterwards proceeded to Athens.

Here the insurgent leader Ulysses (Odysseus) was in command, to whose fortunes Trelawny speedily attached himself, remaining on terms of the closest friendship with that chieftain until his career was brought to a sudden end. During his mission to the Morea in June 1824 Major Temple,[1] Resident at Santa Maura, met Ulysses, and describes him as 'a perfect Albanian chieftain: savage in manners and appearance, of great muscular strength, and about six feet high,' adding that 'he entertained us with the miraculous cures of his Turkish surgeon.' But he was the very leader to attract a man of the Pirate's temperament.

He had his headquarters in an extensive cavern in the face of the precipices of Mount Parnassus, which he had strongly fortified and rendered impossible of approach. (An engraving of this cave is to be found in the *Younger Son*, though it has nothing whatever to do with the adventures there recorded.) Here he kept his family in security, and stowed the treasure which he had accumulated, as well as that of many of his friends, thus rendering himself an additional object of the jealousy of his enemies in the Greek Government.

In the winter of 1823–24 Trelawny accompanied Ulysses as *aide-de-camp* upon an expedition into Eubœa (Negropont), and on their return to Athens, where Colonel Stanhope (Earl of Harrington) had by this time arrived, Trelawny sent a letter to his mother, of which the following is an extract:—

Athens, 18th of February 1824.

DEAR MOTHER,— . . . I am enabled to keep twenty-five followers, Albanian soldiers, with whom I have joined the most enterprising of the Greek captains and most powerful—Ulysses. I am much with him, and have done my best during the winter campaign, in which we have besieged Negroponte, to make

[1] Father of the late Archbishop Temple.

up for the many years of idleness I have led. I am now in my element, and the energy of my youth is reawakened. I have clothed myself in the Albanian costume and sworn to uphold the cause.

Everything here is going on as well as heart can wish. Great part of Greece is already emancipated. The Morea is free, and we are making rapid progress to the westward. Lord Byron spends [£]5,000 a year in the cause and maintains 500 soldiers. This will in the eyes of the world redeem the follies of his youth.

Your affectionate son,

EDWARD TRELAWNY.

Mrs. Maria Trelawny, Fleet Street, London.

The *Younger Son* contains a print of Trelawny in 'Greek dress,' from a portrait by Kirkup; but it will be noticed that he himself styles it Albanian costume. What is called Greek dress was in fact adopted by the Greeks in imitation of the Albanian highlanders, who at this time were at the height of their warlike fame, the white kilt being copied from that worn by the Tosks of Albania. It is just as if cockneys were to be seized with the idea of strutting about in the picturesque costume of the Scottish Highlanders, and called it English.

In December 1823, upon the appointment of Mavrocordato as Dictator of Western Greece, Lord Byron had decided to go to Missolonghi, and at that unhealthy spot, situated in the midst of swamps, he landed early in January.

Colonel Stanhope proposed a congress of the civil and military leaders, to meet at Salona, and to this Ulysses agreed. Trelawny set out for Missolonghi to invite Lord Byron and the western chiefs, but before his arrival there on the 24th of April, Byron had breathed his last. Mavrocordato looked upon Trelawny as a personal enemy, thinking that the latter only wanted to get Lord Byron out of his hands, and when Trelawny left, taking into his pay as many of Byron's followers as he could afford to maintain, Mavrocordato foisted upon him one Fenton to act as a spy.

After returning by way of Salona, Trelawny again accompanied Ulysses into Eastern Greece, where, as he says, they 'carried on the war in the same desultory way as before, unaided by the Government and left to our own resources.' In the autumn Trelawny was at Argos, whence a letter (supposed to be his), of which the following is an extract, was written to his brother, Lieutenant Trelawny, R.N.

Argos, 5th of October 1824.

. . . To give you an idea of the misery existing here is beyond all expression. The Town is nothing more or less than a chaos of ruins, not a house inhabitable. The fever making great havoc, people actually falling down in the streets. The stench of the place so great I am obliged to remove my quarters to the once famous Argos, not more than an hour's walk from Agamemnon's tomb, which I have not yet seen. The scenery is beautiful; perfectly romantic. I am now living in a house without doors or windows; every man armed.

The Commissioners are both sick. Mr. Bulwer has proposed to raise a body of fifty men, but I am afraid it will all evaporate in smoke, like all his under-

takings here. I am much afraid nothing is to be done: they look on all foreigners as intruders. Many of the French have behaved most shamefully, but, as I told you before, I will exert every effort. All my hopes are placed in Colonel Gordon's arrival.

Your brother [no signature].

The Commissioners referred to were Henry Lytton Bulwer (Lord Dalling) and J. H. Browne, sent out by the Greek Committee, when it was too late, to see if the nature of the Greek Government warranted the payment of that part of the loan raised in England on their behalf not already advanced.

The whole business was a sorry exhibition of incompetence and mismanagement. For instance, at the outset, the Committee appointed as Commissioners to superintend the disbursement of the moneys Lord Byron, Colonel Stanhope, and Colonel Napier, names beyond cavil or reproach; but the two latter were officers on the active list, who, with any pretence to the maintenance of neutrality, could not possibly have been allowed to act. Lord Byron died, and the business came to a standstill when the Greeks were in urgent need of help. Colonel Stanhope was recalled at the instance of the Porte; and Colonel Napier (the most famous of that name) was absolutely inadmissible, for he was Resident and Commandant at Cephalonia.

No War Office could have been capable of more egregious blundering than the philosophical Radicals of the Greek Committee. Their intentions were excellent, but we all know where the road leads that is paved with such material.

The following, from J. C. Hobhouse (Lord Broughton), one of the Committee, to J. H. Browne, conveys a good idea of the complacent and patronising British attitude which the foreigner finds so pleasing:—

Chisholme, 3rd of October, 1824.

The Loan, alas! looks as sick as ever, and I fear is on its Death-bed, unless you can prescribe any remedy during your expedition. . . . I do not despair yet of clubbing my canteen with yours at Argos some time next year—nothing would give me greater pleasure—and if I can persuade Colonel Stanhope to go with me, so much the better. He can legislate and I can look on. He is a most excellent and valuable person, and has done enough for Greece to be styled her principal benefactor.

Ellice (another of the Committee, and sometime M.P. for Westminster), at whose house I am, sends his best regards.

Ulysses became beset with difficulties, the Government refusing to supply him with men or money. Towards the end of 1824 it appears, from a letter of Barff at Zante, that Trelawny had sent his friend Captain Humphreys to Hancock at Cephalonia to raise money, but that he had failed to do so. (Barff and Hancock, of Zante and Cephalonia, were Lord Byron's bankers in the Ionian Islands.)

Ultimately Ulysses made a truce for three months with Omer Pasha, of Negropont; but being now regarded with suspicion by both

sides, he endeavoured to make his escape, and left Trelawny in charge of the cave and all it contained. It was during this period, in the month of May 1825, that an attempt to assassinate him was made by Fenton, the spy, and an accomplice named Whitcombe. One of these—probably the latter—treacherously shot Trelawny in the back while they were all engaged in target-practice on the terrace below the cave. Fenton was then shot out of hand by the sentry on duty above, but upon the abject supplications of Whitcombe, Trelawny was generous enough to spare his life, though the men would have made short work of him. The whole affair is graphically described in the *Records*. Trelawny's wounds were so dangerous that he suffered for three months before he could be said to have recovered, but patience and a strong constitution finally triumphed.

Ulysses found himself obliged to surrender to the Government troops, and was taken to the Acropolis of Athens, where he was murdered in the following July. Trelawny's mother, hearing of the catastrophe to her son, wrote on the 5th of September to Sir Frederick Adam, Lord High Commissioner at Corfu, as follows:—

I presume to address you, although my introduction was the very distant period of your residence at Weymouth when your good and amiable Brother, now Admiral Adam, had the command of a Frigate to protect Majesty; since which time I have become the only protector of my family, and implore you to relieve me from a state of most dreadful anxiety about my son E. J. Trelawny,[2] who at one time sailed with your brother.

My son accompanied his friend Lord Byron to Greece. We have had accounts of his having attached himself to the fortunes of Odysseus. By this day's post Mr. Hobhouse has been so kind as to send me a letter signed Humphreys, and dated from Zante, 24th of July, wherein he gives a very particular account of his being still in a cave in Mount Parnassus, where it appears he remains as the only protector of Ulysses' family and property; that an English or Scotch man attempted to assassinate him; and that Trelawny received a considerable wound.

To you, my dear Sir, I must apply to relieve him from this dreadful situation, his life being in great danger, either by demanding him as a British subject, or any other way you consider most likely to succeed. I need not add the anxious state of my mind, or how great my obligation would be to you by any exertions you may make to save my son.

M. TRELAWNY-BRERETON.

In the face of the above, a remark of Trelawny's in the *Adventures*, written only a few years later, seems rather uncalled for. Speaking of the tenacity with which a wild animal will protect her young, he says: 'I wish my good mother would sometimes think of hers; it is so long since she gave them birth that perhaps she may not remember she ever had any.'

Fortunately there was now no need for the intervention of the Lord High Commissioner, for, word having been brought to Captain

[2] Second son of Lieut.-Colonel C. Trelawny, M.P., of Shotwick, and Maria, sister of Sir C. Hawkins, Bart., of Trewithen. Colonel Trelawny took the additional name of Brereton some years after his marriage (v. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

Hamilton, commanding our naval squadron in Greek waters, that officer insisted upon Trelawny's safety, and offered to receive him on board one of his ships. By this means he effected his escape to Cephalonia, and on the 12th of September Colonel Napier writes to the Secretary at Corfu (Colonel Rudsdell) :—'Trelawny is just arrived in the *Zebra*, Captain Williams. I could therefore make no reasonable objection to his landing. He is in quarantine, so his Excellency may do as he likes : his wife is with him.'

But the last had not been heard of the dastardly attack upon Trelawny, for in the following February, when he was still in Cephalonia, Colonel Rudsdell tells Colonel Napier that two Englishmen called Whitcombe, brothers of the one who was accused of being concerned in the outrage which took place in the cave of Ulysses, had arrived in the islands, and taken out licence from the Police Office in Corfu for Cephalonia. They were supposed to be going to call Trelawny to account for the representation he had made of the affair in the cave, in which their brother was materially involved. 'You are to take most effectual measures to prevent a breach of the peace. You will require from Mr. Trelawny to enter into recognisances not to commit any breach of the peace, and also from the Whitcombes, or in default not allow them to stay, and prevent any hostile meeting.'

On the next day the Whitcombes (T. D. and W. E.) called on the Secretary and informed him that they sought an interview with Trelawny for the sole purpose of ascertaining from him the real state of their brother's proceeding, and to obtain from the former any assurance, if he had it in his power fairly and conscientiously to give it, that their brother's conduct had not been of so dark a kind as had been set forth. Colonel Rudsdell told them that circumstances might arise which might produce a quarrel, and, unless they would give security or make a declaration on honour that they would not have a hostile meeting with Trelawny, they would not be allowed to go to Cephalonia.

Each of them then gave his word of honour in writing that his intentions were not hostile, and declared that he would not fight a duel with Trelawny. The Secretary then informed Colonel Napier and said, 'You therefore need not demand security from them. But you will still insist on Trelawny's maintaining the peace in such manner as will satisfy you that no meeting of an unfriendly nature shall happen betwixt the parties.'

As to his doings during this and the following year the Pirate is very reticent, but we are told that he was detained in the islands by a 'villainous lawsuit.' Upon this considerable light is now thrown. In the postscript of a letter of the 15th of November 1827 to Mr. J. A. Toole, Deputy-Collector of Customs at Corfu and a practical sympathiser with the Greeks, Mr. H. Robinson, of Zante, says :—'Trelawny, who goes by this steamboat, asked me for a few lines to you, which

I have given him. He is a good fellow, although a singular one. His object in going to Corfu is to expedite his lawsuit with his wife, whose family are merely carrying on the suit to get money out of T.'

In connection with this business, we now come to an extraordinary story which the writer in the *Dictionary*, whom for the sake of convenience I will call X., dismisses by the light of logic as untrue. This is a pity, because no better illustration of the Pirate's recklessness of disposition and utter disregard of the restraints of conventionality could be found even in his own writings. After stating that Trelawny's daughter Zella (which reminds one of the heroine of the *Adventures*) was born about June 1826, X. goes on:—'The frequent mention of this child in his subsequent correspondence with Mrs. Shelley, and even later, refutes the story of her death and the treatment of her remains told by J. G. Cooke (*Life and Letters of Jos. Severn*, p. 265).'

Obviously if a child were alive, it could not be dead; but thinking that if the Pirate was said to be guilty of anything particularly outrageous, there was most likely to be some truth in it, I had the curiosity to look up the *Life of Severn*, and there found a letter written by Cooke to Mr. Walter Severn,[3] in answer to a request to send any news of Pirate Trelawny or others connected with the Byron, Shelley, and Keats period.

29th of June 1878.

Did I ever tell you a wonderful story . . . which I heard when a midshipman in the Mediterranean in '35, not so very long after the Greek War of Independence, when Trelawny distinguished himself? It is a curious and rather a ghastly story. Your father will well remember that when T. was in Greece he lived *maritalement* with a daughter of the great Greek chief Odysseus in the Morea, and she had a child by him. When T. left Greece for Italia he took this child with him. Months afterwards the Odysseus family was made aware of the certainty of not seeing their respected son-in-law again, and wrote to him begging that the child might be sent back. A long time passed, and at last comes a letter to say if the chief Odysseus or his representative would come across on a certain day to the Custom House at Zante, the child should be forthcoming. A *scampavia* (boat) was despatched and away went some of the Odysseus family to Zante. The Custom House authorities could give no account of any child, but they stated that a box had arrived *via* Corfu, which it was much wished should be removed by the Greeks, as it smelt offensively. Whereupon the box was delivered and opened, and a child's body, dead some weeks, appeared! Whether any invoice or remarks by T. accompanied it I never heard. The child had died, and he took this grim and savage way of ridding himself of all connection with the Odysseus circle.

I wonder I never thought, when in New Zealand some thirty-five years ago, and in constant communication with Mr. C. A. Brown, of asking him if he had heard this story. My sister, who has been dead some fourteen years, was wife to the British Resident, Major John Longley, a brother of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and she had heard it from Zantiotes, although it must have happened before J. L. became Resident.

[3] Joseph Severn was a painter of distinction, and H.M. Consul at Rome. Walter Severn, his son, was an 'examiner' in what was till lately called the Education Department, but probably better known to the public as himself also a painter.

Now although this letter might be useless as evidence in a court of law, that is no reason why it should be cast aside by a historian, who has the utmost liberty to extract the truth from anything that comes in his way. Moreover, the story comes from people of education and position, for the wife of a Resident at Zante would not be likely to consort with village gossips; while on the facts as set out there is no mention of any child by name, so that X.'s conclusion is scarcely warranted, for there might have been another child.

Cooke's story, indeed, affords a very pretty instance of the transmission of fact by hearsay, and of the way in which the truth thus becomes obscured, which is worth attention: for the gist and kernel of the story—the essentials stripped of the trimmings and flounces that fifty years had dressed them in—are perfectly true.

Writing to Tooke on the 22nd of November 1827 (*i.e.* a week after the date of his previous letter), Robinson says:—

> I am much obliged by your attention to Trelawny; the stories you have heard are doubtless exaggerated. I will tell you the real one. During the time his wife was in the convent she was delivered of a daughter, whom she sent as soon as born to Trelawny. He put it out to nurse: it died, and he as a punishment for the mother's unfeeling conduct sent the dead body to the Castle monastery, where she was, in a box with her things and a message from him. The wife knew not what was in the box, and refused to open it, and there it lay until putrid.
>
> An examination took place with all the fuss which the Courts make about *suspicione d' infanticidio*, and ended by T. being fined ten dollars for improperly removing a dead body.

This brings us to within a year, more or less, of the occurrence, but it is still second-hand evidence, and we will go a step further. In or about the month of July 1829 Signora Trelawny herself makes petition [4] to the Lord High Commissioner to the following effect:—

> It is perhaps known to Y.E. that at about the age of thirteen years I was given in marriage to Signor Trelawny, my family urging that I should live happily with one brought up in the courtesy and good-breeding of his country; but, as my experience proved, he failed to treat me with that consideration and nobility of character which distinguish the men of his nation. The nature of the long-continued treatment which I have had to endure at the hands of the said Signor Trelawny is not unknown, and at the last, it is perhaps within Y.E.'s recollection that he brought grief to my very eyes by sending me while in the Convent, with cunning and brutality, the dead body of my daughter and his. [She then stated that Zante had now become lonely for her, as her brothers and mother had gone to Greece. She wanted to go to Paxò to her sister, but the custom of Zante obliged a wife separated from her husband to stay in the convent.]
>
> I venture [she continues] humbly to ask Y.E. if, being the wife of an Englishman, I ought to be subject to the custom of the island in which by chance I find myself a resident. Should an Englishwoman be a subject of such treatment as mine? [She then begs H.E.'s interest on her behalf.] I

[4] The original is in Italian, but the signature is in the Greek character.

promise Y.E. that, in whatever place or situation I find myself, I will conduct myself always as is proper for the wife of an English gentleman; and though he himself may be wanting in dignity of behaviour, I will do neither him nor myself the dishonour of imitating him.

TERSITZA PHILIPPA TRELAWNY.

Upon the petition and the facts of the case the conclusion arrived at was that there was no occasion whatever for the request contained in the memorial of Signora Trelawny to his Excellency, as there appeared to be no impediment to her leaving the convent where she then was and proceeding to Paxò.

She had obtained a separation from her husband *a mensa et toro* by a sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, and by definitive sentences of the courts of law in Zante and Corfu she was entitled to an aliment from her husband of twenty-five dollars a month (for the payment of which Mr. Barff, of Zante, and Mr. Stevens, of Corfu, were securities), apparently without any restriction as to the place of abode. She went to inhabit the convent of her own free choice, without the consent of her husband; and if she now wished to change her place of abode and found impediments thrown in her way (which, however, did not appear to be the case) she was to apply by petition to the proper Court, which would decide according to the merits of the case.

Thus we arrive at some idea of the 'villainous lawsuit' and of the truth contained in a fifty-year-old story. Whitewashing is evidently a dangerous pastime, for facts have an inconvenient way of cropping up and laughing at logic; and it is gratifying to find (on the principle of *nil humani alienum*) that Cooke did his best to tell what he had heard, and that a grim piece of devilry which would do credit to an Adelphi melodrama is still left to us as an instance of the capabilities of a remarkable man.

T. C. DOWN.

OUR BROTHERS, THE BEASTS

SCHOPENHAUER rules the world for him who thinks. The infinite and eternal substance, the real essence of existence he declared to be Will; the whole of creation, including mankind, being substance of the Omnipotent Will. He maintained that Christian morality but for the defect of ignoring the animal world would manifest the utmost similarity to that of Brahmanism and Buddhism, and is only less emphatically expressed and more deficient in logic. Schopenhauer's ethical system touching the subject of kindness to animals compared with the Buddhistic precept is well summed up thus. With Buddha it seems to repose simply upon the instinct of compassion; Schopenhauer gives it a philosophical basis. With him animals are imperfect men, incarnations of the universal Will in a more primitive form. Their kinship to mankind is no mere figure of speech, but the simplest matter of fact.

The difference between the self-consciousness, relegated to us by the author of *The Religion of Nature*[1] in distinction from that unconsciousness he transfers theoretically to the beautiful creature world, can only be one of degree, varying individually in each man and beast in an ascending scale, from the capacity of feeling joy and grief, affection and pain, to that further spiritual consciousness of which the highest manifestation is sympathy and love for our kind. They suffer and die for us; we owe them love and consideration.

The fact that the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals secured upwards of eight thousand convictions for one year has been charitably set down to thoughtlessness and ignorance.

Spain and Italy are proverbially infamous in their treatment of animals, and after a sojourn in France we cannot say that indifference to the animal sufferings is confined to the lower classes.

Our fascinating friends across the Channel have reason to retort 'Take thought on your own savage ways,' but in England it is universally stated that we have so far advanced beyond other countries as to give more liberal support to the societies for the protection of animals.

In the marked beauty of Varengeville, on the coast of France, we

[1] *The Religion of Nature*, by E. K. Robinson.

realise the deserved praise of *la belle Normandie.* From the balcony of the little house where I lived through last summer and autumn I looked across an undulating valley, clothed in purple and gold, aflame with yellow broom, tall heather in perfection of colour, and bracken swept by *les brises affolées* from sea or land. They sing up to the dark pines which skirt the valley on the south, east, and west. These skirting pine woods are veritable harp-strings for the hushing music of winds. The sea alternates from chrysoprase to sapphire, and the sky is of that cerulean blue which is the French painter's delight. When the wind blows from the east the strike of every hour is borne through the pine woods from the old Varengeville church, which almost hangs over the sea, for it stands close to the edge of the high white cliffs, washed by the waves. Close by is the celebrated Manoir Angot, bombarded and partly brought to the ground by the English, where François I. lived with a great retinue and chased the wild boar.

Up the road which passed my house, the bright orange-tiled roof above the pines is an endowed summer school for Rouennais children, who, dressed like little pilgrims, pass to and fro singing in a high treble old French songs, notably that of the martyrdom of St. Catherine :

La Sainte-Catherine,
Bala zim bam boom !
La Sainte-Catherine,
Fille d'un roi païen,
Aia ! aia !
Fille d'un roi païen.

Son père était barbare,
Bala zim bam boom !
Son père était barbare,
Sa mère ne l'était pas,
V'là ! v'là !
Sa mère ne l'était pas.

And so on gleefully through some twenty verses to the tragic finale. The tragedy of animal suffering which you meet at every turn none could tolerate but such a monster as the pagan king of that blood-curdling old nursery song. *Chars à bancs* laden with hulking humanity inside and out, drawn by scarecrow horses covered with sores, in acute raw-necked misery, urged on by the lash when to threats and imprecations they object to move, were every-day sights. As the season wanes, dogs left by callous owners to the tender mercies of brutal guardians rush from house to house searching for food, living skeletons, with bones protruding through their skins, many of them half-drowned, with the tell-tale stone still hanging round their necks. In one case I myself had to cut on the instant the soaking rope from the neck of a dog that crawled to my house in the agony of suffocation.

I think of another little French hamlet in a green valley

where I found myself one day, of the pink and yellow cottages with their bright roofs, glowing in the sunlight, set within fair flowering orchards under a canopy of blue, little streets through which I saw the shimmering sea, while my ears rang with the cries of agony which echoed through them. A peasant told me: 'Ce sont des veaux; voilà vingt-quatre heures qu'ils crient la soif.' You must give them to drink, I answered. I recall her brutal laughter: 'Dieu! Cela gâtera leur chair.' And, to my look of horror, the shrug and the laugh: 'Dame, que voulez-vous? Ce ne sont que des veaux!' And when I turned from her disgusted, followed by their cries of anguish, it was to find myself confronted by an object four foot high, with eyes asquint, his tongue lolled from a twisted mouth, his arms like fins protruded from misshapen shoulders. His legs were bowed, his feet reversed. This was poor Baptiste, a hunted dwarf, for he was butt of the whole village. Close by there stood the 'Sovereign's Mill,' which had been silent now for generations. There was a fair to-day, here at the very gates of Death. The merry-go-round was full of happy children. The lusty stroke of the blacksmith's hammer at the glowing forge kept time to dance and song. The merry-go-round and marionettes touched the gates of Death, the closed gates of an ancient château on whose inmates, descended from the mighty kings of France, had just befallen one of the greatest tragedies of our time. These are the ironies which stagger and dismay us unless we see the breaking light of the state beyond, that lacks not, but gives to right the right—a state where the Sovereign's Mill turns for ever unbroken to the music of pure waters, where Baptiste the crooked dwarf will be made straight, the brute peasant made human, the tortured calves given to drink.

In our chance travelling encounters with loquacious fellow-travellers, who are strangers to us, our attention may be distracted from our own cogitations by a passing word, a trivial remark, leading to a topic which interests us, and before we have time to realise it we are unconsciously taking a silent yet eloquent part in the conversation. The purgatory of our position is when in a foreign country we hear our national beliefs or prejudices made light of. Prudence forbids our interference lest we transgress the rules of social politeness. Our national courtesy, we feel, must be upheld, and in France especially we are amongst polite people. We also resent that behind our back they may call us *bizarre!* On such occasions it is well to suffer and be still.

Travelling during the last hunting season in the same compartment from Paris to Y—— with two French gentlemen and a lady equipped for the 'Chasse à Courre,' from a conversation in which they all talked at once, the words of one caught my ear: 'Quel bel équipage que celui du Marquis d'X——.' 'Quelle chasse mardi dernier!' and the answer of his friend, 'Une chasse inouïe,' and the amazon in

her corner, 'Une chasse épatante!' The hunt of Tuesday they discussed I knew must be the 'Chasse au Cerf,' the 'Chasse au Sanglier' having been rendered practically impossible in the Forêt d'Y—— by the migration of the wily animals far and wide, who objected to having their snouts bumped and caught in by the wire fencing erected to restrain the small game. The conversation continued, the first speaker complimenting the lady on her riding—'Madame suivait à merveille.' She smiled, and said in English: 'It was almost like an English fox-hunt, there were so many obstacles, so much jumping.' The first speaker added, 'Enfin rien ne manquait—la forêt, la plaine, et l'eau,' and his friend, 'Le bat l'eau [2] c'était ravissant, n'est-ce pas?' They lauded the hounds, the horses, and, not least, themselves. I expected to hear some note of consideration, perhaps admiration, for the noble quarry, so distinguished for its gentle, sensitive qualities. They dwelt with enthusiasm on the manner in which the pack had taken their victim in the water. The lady slapped her knee with her riding-whip, and with a shoulder-shrug confessed—but very apologetically, and as if ashamed for her remark—that she thought 'the death struggle had been perhaps a little too prolonged.' She used the expression, 'Cela m'était un peu désagréable,' and added, 'Où était le pistolet?' The gentlemen both laughed merrily, and one said: 'Comment! Madame n'a pas vu? il a raté.' Then all three laughed, and spoke of the English stag-hunting with the Windsor buckhounds. Of course they ridiculed the use of the cart, which they spoke of as *un omnibus*. The temptation was almost irresistible to say: 'A gilded chariot would be poor honour to convey home to peace so great a hero, martyred for your day's enjoyment.' They were apparently unaware that our humane King had some years ago condemned this pastime. Their sporting talk took me back to a wonderful *chasse*—a boar-hunt I had followed some years ago with the *équipage* in question—with the 'Bat l'eau' and the 'Hallali' in the lake, and to the day I had first seen a wild boar domesticated at a farmhouse in the outskirts of the Forêt d'Y—— (not so exquisite as his name, for he was called 'Eglantine'). He was a merry, engaging rascal, whose great allies and playmates were the pack of boarhounds, with whom he romped and fraternised, for whom he played quarry, running till he dropped, providing for his friends, human and canine, many a fine run, hunters, hounds, and sweet Eglantine' always returning home together on the best of terms. At last, as might be expected, he showed character, took the game into his own hands, and refused to go the pace.

It is a matter of history that a brutal and ignorant aristocracy lived for nothing but to fight, to hunt, and to kill. The Franks were always renowned as hunters. Among the Merovingians was

[2] Opinions are, I believe, divided as to whether the old term 'Bat l'eau' stood for 'beating the water' or for 'La Bête à l'eau,' 'the beast in the water.'

Dagobert the First, the most famous of royal hunters. Childebert the Second first developed into a rudimentary art and science the chase of wild animals, which has existed from all ages. Charlemagne in later days gave preference to wolf, bear, and boar hunting. It is historical that St. Louis created in France ‘ la charge de grand veneur,’ and that from his reign date the first rules of ‘ La Vénerie ’ of France which have established ‘ la chasse à courre ’ as a memorable institution. Though imposing and stately, the decorative side of La Grande Venerie in the time of the Bourbon dynasty lost somewhat in artistic value through too much theatrical display. In refinement of cruelty it has remained the same. The methods of taking the quarry were various. In comparing past and present methods of this lustful sport, we are forced to acknowledge that the rules governing it in the Dark Ages which we hear spoken of as less civilised were really more civilised than now, for those rules comported more rough justice than the rules of our own day. It is strange to acknowledge it, seeing that we boast of our humane modes of thinking, and believe that we are psychically in advance of those backward times, and that the day of mercy has dawned.

The spacious Château d'X—— was built under the direction of the present marquis. The exterior is in the style of the renaissance of François the First. The decorations of the interior vary from Louis the Fourteenth and Louis the Fifteenth. The sleepy river is bordered by the forest; it flows past the wide demesnes of the château in the shape of the letter S on its way to join its confluent at six kilometres distant. Great brown barges, heavy laden, with long ropes, trailed by eight fine horses with plaited manes and tails, caparisoned in the old picturesque harness, are less frequently seen nowadays, for steam traction is in vogue. This morning the music of the horse-bells I have heard a long way off heralding the slow approach of one of these silent vessels long before it came in sight. When at last, towed by ropes of great length, one came and went, winding down to L——, gone out of view through the grey stillness, like a reminiscence and echo of old times, there was the drift of autumn leaves, feathers, sticks, waifs and strays of the dying season to watch, floating down the nonchalant river, passing and repassing each other on their unconscious way to win the ocean. A jostling race and aimless, suggesting the hustling race of human life, in which the last to start is as likely to win as the first. In the forest which borders this sleepy river you hear perhaps far off the blast of the ‘ Bien-Aller,’ and know that a stag's race for his life is near the finish.

A rendezvous of the ‘ Chasse à Courre ’ at the doors of the château is always more than usually picturesque. The equipage is unrivalled. The pack of from seventy to eighty staghounds is beyond criticism. On the flank of each hound the capital letter is branded, so that the one who strays shall be recognised far and wide. The costume

of the hunt for ladies and gentlemen is a neutral tint with deep velvet revers of antique cut, harmonising well with the quiet grey of an autumn morning. The gentlemen wear the time-honoured black velvet hunting casquette, the ladies the small tricornes.

We must follow on horseback to know thoroughly the excitement of the chase; but if we have no mount much interesting detail may be observed if we are driven by an unerring monitor of great experience at a hand gallop through the interminable green avenues of such a forest as the forest of Y——, with the innumerable great *carrefours* for one's guidance, and our eyes and ears on the rack. At daybreak on the morning I speak of a *quatrième tête* was harboured. The rendezvous over at the château, we who drive, and they who ride, are off to see the *attaque* and *débucher* of the stag. There are deep, beautiful gorges in this part of the forest, rapid ascents and descents with endless crossways, and distant views of wooded country beyond. In the great silences at the meeting of many ways we waited, listening for the *trompe* to announce the *attaque*; for, as they know who are versed in the art of venerie, every fanfare has its place in a sequence which declares and particularises the movements of the quarry. We waited, but not long. A high dilapidated tree sent down a golden leaf. I watched it float. It had not reached the ground when burst upon our ears the rousing blast of the first *trompe*—the *attaque*, then the *quatrième tête*; a few minutes of breathless expectation, then the *débucher*, and we were off at a hand gallop through the forest, now breasting, now descending rapid steeps, threading avenues and gorges. Presently there was a check. A company of stags passed. Our quarry, it was rumoured, had joined them. Terrified, they were turning their majestic heads from side to side, sniffing the air. A 'daguet' we saw among them met his end a few minutes afterwards, for in his terror he alarmed the villagers of the little town into which he fled. A shot announced that a frightened peasant had despatched him. 'La Vue' now woke the echoes, then the 'Bien Aller,' and we viewed the hunted animal bounding across our route, and after him, not very near, the pack were pressing in full cry. Then came delays, so many checks, that 'Messieurs les Veneurs' were losing patience. At the great *carrefours* where we halted one heard on every side: 'Quelle chasse ennuyeuse! Qu'il est rusé, cet animal!' Again and again the hounds lost scent. The people, peasants, and gaping outsiders at the crossways headed him off continually. Nearly four hours had passed, and the uninitiated would certainly have said the stag would now have it all his own way. A drizzling rain had set in, helping to obliterate the scent. Young hounds were straggling, turning up at unexpected places. Came a moment for the unsporting to make merry for the stag's escape, when kindly sportsmen fairly minded might rejoice that life so hardly earned seemed promised as

the gentle victim's guerdon. But a moment. For on leaving a *carrefour*, where stood a throng of much-excited malcontents, we came upon the master of the hounds—the marquis, alone, marking the footprint of the quarry with the time-honoured custom of placing the branch. He raised his *trompe*, he blew the 'Vol ce l'est.'[3] Just then the fated stag broke through the forest, crossed our route immediately in front of us. 'Il a doublé[4] ses voies,' as the old French term has it. He slowly plunged along, hesitated, then towards another *carrefour* made his way, stumbling, groping as in darkness, lost, terror-blind, in sweat of direst agony, his thick and choking sobs most pitiful to hear. We halted. No sound of the hounds' song yet reached our ears. The mob howling at the crossways caused the stag to turn up to the right. I never can forget the dread that came then over me, disgust and horror at the brutish faces of those peasants, filled with blood-lust. The emotions stamped upon them were indeed not human. 'V'là ! le v'là. . . . C'est lui ! . . . C'est bien lui, lui ! la quatrième tête ! ' they cried. Far, far away the hounds were giving tongue, but faintly, in a straggling chorus incomplete, telling us the pack had not as yet recovered the lost scent. Now the shouts of *piqueurs* and the yell of hounds approached nearer and nearer. Up and alongside of us they galloped, *piqueurs* urging horse and hounds, bent double over saddle-bow, hat in hand, waving the tardiest on to the lost scent, hoarse with shouting 'Tayaut ! Tayaut ! Tayaut ! V'là, v'là ! au coute ! au coute ! ' and as the pack nosed the ground and passed the branch to renewed shouts of 'Tayaut ! Ha, v'là, v'là ! ' they scoured by in fuller and yet fuller cry, hot on the lost trail, with the doomed stag in view. Someone said : 'If he takes to the river we lose him.' As we sped along at any moment we might hear the 'Bat l'eau,' the fanfare, which perhaps more than all others sounds a plaint ; indeed it rings with sadness, some great sadness. He must have known pity who put to the old plaintive notes the words :

Le pauvre animal
Il va bien mal,
Il va dans l'eau
Creuser son tombeau.

The pace of this one now was slackening visibly. He would never win the river, never beat water again, still less cross it. Despair, intolerable fear were on him, and the yelling pack second by second gaining way. In his bewilderment he turned, and once more to the right—confronted by a huge wire fence without exit, cornered, backed, barricaded in by a wall of howling persecutors, people and hounds—he turned at bay. It was a death trap.

For accustomed or unaccustomed eye-witnesses it was an episode among the 'plaisirs de la chasse' with which they have been made

[3] The footprint of the animal. [4] Doubled.

long familiar by sensational pictures of brute martyrdom. The noble creature, the forced stag in torture of fear, hunted to death at my feet, battling with the hounds in prolonged agony. Hanging to him by their teeth they tore him down. Upon his knees he made brave fight. . . . Would he not rise and have yet one more chance? It was a sight I never shall forget, nor the instinctive horror and revolt possessing one—conscious that every drop of our heart's blood is for the stag, and yet that our inward cry for justice is impotent as our power to save. I stepped forward. . . . Someone dragged me back, protesting. Had I not heard how the other day a woman had been trampled to death by the frenzied stag? . . . It happened, as it often does, that the despatching pistol was not forthcoming—the lives of hounds would have been endangered. The pack had taken him too well—they bit and tore him to death. I looked round absolutely dumbfounded. The breath was not out of his body. Smiling ladies and gentlemen looked on perfectly composed; the former ate chocolate out of little *bonbonnières*, while the martyr of their day's amusement was at last despatched with the knife. I staggered back against a lady who said 'Quelle belle chasse! N'est-ce pas?' And I am conscious of having said, 'Intéressante, oui—mais tout ce qu'il y a de plus barbare!' at which some gathered round; one said with astonishment, while she offered me her bonbons, 'Vous trouvez?' I added, 'Ignoble, dégoûtant!' and a friend apologised for me by saying that in England we were brought up to think much of the societies for the protection of animals. No one laughed; one said 'Mais ce n'est qu'un cerf,' another said angrily, 'Les bêtes n'ont pas d'âme!' and another, 'On tue les brebis—pensez donc aux abattoirs!' I said, 'Madame, d'abord on ne chasse pas les brebis et causer la souffrance pour notre agrément, voilà le crime!' A voice in the crowd said, 'Les bêtes sont créées pour notre agrément;' adding 'Oh, la salé bête!' As he pressed forward, this speaker had the courage of his opinions. I had faced a sanguinary 'hallali' to a scientific but a cruel chase. That fanfare over, now it was the *curée*—the hounds' fee. The veneurs gathered round their trophy raised their *trompes* and sounded the *curée* with might and main. The hounds strained at leash to reach their steaming, palpitating feast. Above the entrails the grand antlered head was held, and, like an overhanging canopy, his empty skin outspread was swung—swayed to and fro by a *piqueur*, as an incentive to the maddened hounds. It looked an effigy of the brute's martyrdom animated by men in ghastly mockery of his suffering—a ceremony the fascination of which cowardly men and unsexed women with the lust of blood on them perhaps can analyse. In that atmosphere of carnage one felt that much the same thing happens to the people as to the hounds—their higher feelings are dowsed by the smell of corruption. It belongs to all those floating demons of the air—they who are floating through

their crime, a crime involuntary here perhaps—for in a court of man, superman, inhuman, there must be contagion. We infect each other. The lower animal within us is developed, but at the loss of the higher instincts of the soul. Then we say, What incentive is there to charity? Charity availeth nothing. One suffers and one dies—it is too much trouble to think. If after an episode so cruel and so low we do not turn in anguish with an effort to try and undo, it must be that our senses are dulled.

As the forest rang to the fanfares blown in sequence from the 'Attaque,' to the 'Curée,'—'The Rentrée au Chenil'—we turned home. Through the darkening forest now it seemed the great witch trees stood out staring with empty sockets, gnarled hands in menace, threatening fingers beckoning us away. Night is a curtain of light, and—

> Death is a veil which those who live call life;
> We sleep, and it is lifted.

And if it were lifted now, what of the great world behind our world, the great forest behind the forest? We try to perceive it through our neighbours' darkness and our own. What would confront us? What would confront them on the threshold? We picture the trapped stag, their gentle accuser—he who had taken La Grande Route.

Hubert the hunter, bishop of Liège, was son of Bertrand, Duke of Aquitaine, a Merovingian; he was born A.D. 686; honoured in France through the ages as the patron saint of the chase. The beautiful legend has not been forgotten how the young prince hunted the white hart through the forest of the Ardennes. How it drew him, figuratively speaking, into the kingdom, when, turning and confronting him in the green solitudes, bearing a crucifix between its antlers, he fell on his face prostrate with emotion, and rose converted into a holy man. He had passed into that region of subconsciousness which has been called the Kingdom of Soul. What is the purport of 'La Messe de Saint Hubert,' celebrated every 4th of November with all the pictorial and imposing features of a religious ceremony—the elevation of the Host, the special fanfare of the saint blown on the great 'Trompes de Chasse' within the sacred precincts of the Church?

> Sonnez, piqueurs, pour le saint sacrifice
> La Saint-Hubert, à l'élévation,
> Et quand du seuil le prêtre, après l'office,
> Donne à nos chiens sa bénédiction.

The priestly blessing of the hounds—their baptism with water, what is it if it is not a commemoration of his penitence and of the message he left with us to show mercy to our kindred, the beasts? It gives complete negation to that feeling that we cannot live without slaughter. What a travesty then of truth, a blasphemy, a parody of high thoughts it is to keep such a festival, if from the very doors we start, press on,

praying to be saved from the vile thing we pursue, filled with the lust of blood, as if the saint after more than a thousand years revelled in his former crime! Gentle Hubert, Apostle of Ardennes—who owned the stag, the hind and fawn as friends—protector of the trooping creatures, the four-footed and winged forest things—can we imagine that through the veil from the exhaustless quietudes he or other people of magnitude blend their blast with the 'Hallali' or reach out a hand to bless 'La Curée!' When the piercing notes of 'La Messe de Saint-Hubert' rouse the aisles of forest and fane, we are reminded of a certain truth revealed to him—the stag sealed with the sign of salvation—a sign which proved to Prince Hubert his own brotherhood and the brotherhood of men to the wild things of the forest and field. Through that fanfare named after him we hear a note which speaks of woe. It is no blast of triumph, but of sorrow—a wail of hopeless remorse. It is difficult to believe that it was a 'trompe de chasse' of one whose eyes were not weary of crime—a great *trompe* redeeming 'Le V'là!' We do not know who wrote it, but at all events a part of it is attributed to the penitent hunter. If it does not appeal to us selfish mortals as a blast through the veil, a command from the Unseen behind the Seen—a rebuke, a prayer to remember in time our dumb brethren, it must be then that we are dead—physically, spiritually soul-deaf, soul-blind. It is a cry for pity resonant with regret almost from the first blast to the last Amen.

In one second may happen what does not happen in a thousand years, says the proverb. So it may be with the awakening of the subconscious self. We dare not assume that the receptive mind is less awake or less alert in France than in our own country. Sympathies expressed and unexpressed for animals, and pleas in favour of the justice which we implore for them, are always to be found in every country in the world; but in France it is apparent that the humane thousands have not yet understood the force of concerted action as we have in England. A hunting enthusiast in England is fair in words, but in words only, when he says, 'The spots that modern humanitarians can find on the fair fame of fox-hunting can easily be wiped out by those who love the sport for what is best of it, and never ask that its abuses should remain.' But how shall spots be wiped away indelible as blood-stains on a murderer's hand, which haunt his guilty soul?

Turn to the recorded hunting notes of every day. Read of the running to death of a three-legged fox, among other noted so-called 'smart performances'; and from the same source, 'Quorn Hounds met yesterday at Hoby, and after seeking foxes in divers places, drew Cossington Gorse blank, prior to demolishing a mangy one that struggled none too gamely.' And here is another: 'Hounds got away at once, were very hard on their fox from find to finish, pressed him round the country, rattled him well in S—— wood; draggled, toil-worn and spent,

they rolled him over in A——. It was a fine sporting run of an hour and forty minutes, with a handsome kill!' Further comment is unnecessary, such barbarity speaks for itself, and is little removed from the indefensible brutality of hare-coursing. On the other hand, in favour of our plea, the publicity given to the protest raised against an infamous run of the other day is a good sign of the feeling of the times. I allude to that run in which the poor fox, after a gallant race, took shelter in the dining-room of a house, but was not even then awarded the honour of keeping his beautiful brush. Why should the sentiment expressed by sportsmen for the hounds not be extended to the quarry? The quarry forecasts the hunting morning when it senses unseen hounds and men. The joy of the hounds at the unseen huntsman's approach upon that morning is but equalled by the painful terror of the hunted. The sport is all the more deficient in fair play from the fact that the fox-hounds of to-day have been bred up to a far higher standard of excellence than in former days. Indeed it is said that they have very nearly attained perfection, while the fox, if not deteriorating, has at least gained nothing in strength and endurance.

Acquaintance with the methods of the 'chasse à courre,' English stag-hunting, fox-hunting, and hare-coursing, suggest comparison in which the picturesque dignity and scientific procedure of the 'chasse à courre' stand out undeniably conspicuous. The *veneurs* do not hunt hinds. Nor do they accept the services of any fugitive but the one started for the day's amusement. To change the quarry belongs not to the laws of La Grande Vénerie. But such comparison presents but one conclusion, that in shades of cruelty there is little to choose between them. Shall we say with a shrug or a cry 'Que voulez-vous? Humanity is low, very low, and that is all'?

Meanwhile, as if adhering to the *carte blanche* and as the 'amie de circonstance,' I have written of the hunted, believing that to chase animals to death is a selfish conspiracy of the stronger against the weaker—ignoble, unjust. That it is an assertion of the will which, as Schopenhauer puts it, is an assertion of the body. Just and high thoughts spring from the intelligence, so in the evolution of the world, then, there is hope—hope for the coming day when intelligence must reign supreme, above the sensual, now dominating will. For love is a prayer all-potent. In a certain Eastern stone we find the symbol, that most precious of all precious gems, which scintillates light, manifests 'intra-atomic energy' throughout the ages. It has a traditional name—The Angels' Seal. . . . Shall we who plead for justice—justice for the pursued, not plead for the pursuers? surely, we who know the passion of pursuit? A problem faces us. How to retain the nobler elements of the chase and eliminate the base? Among the best riders to hounds are those who assert that their thoughts are not concentrated on the fate of the quarry, but on the methods of the pack they follow. That in the emulation of the race is their courage

stirred, stimulated by that of the sentient horses they sit, by the pace of the hounds, their own dexterity, their skill and knowledge of the country, when put to the utmost test. Many a brave sportsman would prefer that a fox should wear his brush for many seasons to come. The bravest of sportsmen will be that one who first makes for reform by promoting the inauguration of a chase on the lines of justice. Will not some genius discover and develop such a system? Great riders, notably those who have hunted in Meath—called Royal Meath because of the sporting runs that country affords—testify to the merits of the well-laid drag-hunt. The very best runs on record, they claim, were due to the experience, the skill, the subtle craft of first-rate and superbly mounted drag leaders or riders, who, knowing the country and obstacles by heart, so laid their plans that the skill of horse and rider, and trained methods of the pack, were put to exceptional test. If the delight of the chase is not in the tracking down and torturing to death the wild creatures entrusted to us, not in the scoring blood, nor in the savage instinct inherent in uncivilised man to kill, then, in the rapture of a magnificent gallop and scientific chase, we should have the fulfilment of our desire. With human skill pitted against human skill, method of pursuit against method of escape, drag rider, hunters and hounds would have their courage and skill evenly and individually at stake.

We want a real hunt, no make-believe. But in demanding the real we are reminded not to mistake shadow for substance. The substance which evokes the enthusiasm of the followers, we repeat, is not the taking of the animal, but the adventures of their ride, their dare-devil risks. It is a race for who shall be 'nearest the brush.' The genius among drag riders or leaders would be he who understands the inner side of hunting—the true inwardness of the chase. Masters and huntsmen who know how to breed for hounds of great speed, for powers of nose and endurance, would still be necessary. The drag rider would be one learned in the habits of the wild creatures, well up in lore of forest and field. There is not a quip or crank which we see exercised by the instinct of the terrorised hunted in self-defence for which the drag leader should not be able to substitute a ruse of his own. The elements of uncertainty which go to make up a day's sport, such as losing and finding, would still exist. The masterly casts to recover lines would still have to be exercised. Look how with us the 'trompe de chasse' has gone down in the last few years, yet, to describe the 'chasse à courre' in action, what a splendid adjunct it is, signalling as it does every movement of the quarry to alert followers and listening hounds by the distinguishing notes of a special fanfare blown by one observer alone, or in a concerted blast! Why should not the story of a refined chase in action be in the future told by every artistic and scientific embellishment, such as fanfare sounded on the winding horn—the great 'trompe de chasse'—and be

accompanied with every fit decoration in colour and sound which with purpose we can devise. A blast as the drag-leader's challenge, a start —his second call—the huntsman's sonorous answer—the hunt are off, with 'do and dare' the motto for all, across the open, through flying forests and fields. That could be no dull chase. The hounds, it will be argued, will not run without a strong incentive; but to provide a treat at the finish of the best and strongest would not be difficult—all that is most luscious to suit their canine taste. Let them capture their prize in the open, in forest or river, lake, cave, or sea. . . . Let the 'Attaque,' the 'Débucher,' the 'Vue,' and the 'Bien Aller,' the 'Vol ce l'est,' the 'Bat l'eau,' the 'Hallali,' the 'Curée,' or any other historical fanfares sounded in appropriate order, rouse the limitless echoes of our sphere, and speak through those etheric regions which we dimly begin to discern through boundless space. Those fanfares would do more than sound their practical purpose if, in immortalising the martyrdom of those four-footed heroes in the past, they reminded us that we are in the presence of a progressive, judging Unseen, progressing always in spirit.

To the call of the horn Nature's child awakes, for the very name of 'hunt with horse and hound' arouses thrilling memories—of the 'gazouillement de la forêt,' of the joy of wrestling with the smiting breezes—sweet stings that strike the blood in riding. Think of a chase exalted, just and clean, where selfish lust and cruelty would have no place, where love, goodwill, keen sensuous delight would reign. We should know mirth and frolic, feel the very laughter of wild Nature in our hearts; of a passion of the soul we should have foretaste—Hell left behind us, Heaven open wide before us. . . .

> Come dew, the Light of the eternal springs!
> Oh come green alleys, Liveing Trees look down!

JANEY SEVILLA CAMPBELL.

THE FIRMNESS OF CONSOLS

It has been remarked by De Quincey that 'the English nation has always had a special delight in being alarmed, and in being clearly convinced that it is and ought to be on the brink of ruin.' This observation was made in connection with a treatise published 'somewhere about the year 1755' by the 'once celebrated Dr. Brown,' now, by one of the tricksy pranks of ironical fate, reserved for immortality by the trouncing that his absurdities received from the hands of De Quincey, by way of introduction to an essay on the Revolution of Greece.

It appears that the said Doctor

> took up the conceit that England was ruined at her heart's core by excess of luxury and sensual self-indulgence. He had persuaded himself that the ancient activities and energies of the country were sapped by long habits of indolence and by a morbid plethora of enjoyment in every class. Courage, and the old fiery spirit of the people, had gone to wreck with the physical qualities which had sustained them. . . . It was questionable whether a good hearty assault and battery, or a respectable knock-down blow, had been dealt by any man in London for one or two generations. The doctor carried his reveries as far that he satisfied himself and one or two friends (probably by looking into the parks at hours propitious to his hypothesis) that horses were seldom or ever used for riding; that, in fact, this accomplishment was too boisterous or too perilous for the gentle propensities of modern Britons, and that, by the best accounts, few men of rank or fashion were now seen on horseback. This pleasant collection of dreams did Dr. Brown solemnly propound to the English public, in two octavo volumes, under the title of *An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times*, and the report of many who lived in those days assures us that for a brief period the book had a prodigious run.

The effusion which roused De Quincey's healthy scorn is only one example among many similar jeremiads which have achieved brief popularity during the lifetime of English literature. The shout of 'Actum est de republica' will always attract plenty of listeners among a people that is almost morbidly conscious of its defects, and the eager —apparently almost flattered—readiness of the average Englishman to give ear to any prophet who will tell him that his country is going to the dogs, is still an outstanding feature of the national character.

This special delight in being alarmed was exemplified in a striking

manner at the end of March, when a combination of circumstances quickened the speed of the downward movement in the price of Consols which has been a more or less existent feature of the financial history of the past decade. The fall in Consols was welcomed as a dire portent, presaging the financial downfall of England and indicating rottenness in the City. It became popular 'copy,' dressed out in headlines and excluding even 'All the Winners' from the contents bills. Experts gleefully rubbed in the statement that Consols had not been so low since 1866, and the fun became fast and furious when a political flavour was added to the discussion, and the tumble in the leading British Government security was wholly attributed to the Socialistic proclivities of the present Administration. It is only fair to the Tory publicists who barked so loudly up this tree, to point out that some of their Radical brethren vied with them and beat them. The fall in Consols, which, as will be shown later, was only an outstanding incident in a general decline among securities of a certain class, was accompanied by a similar movement in London County Council Stock. The Moderate victory had happened just before, and this event was connected, by implication, if not by actual statement, with the subsequent fall in the market price of London's credit. Of the two contentions, the latter is certainly the finer effort of political special pleading as applied to financial matters. There is a spice of truth in the statement that the Government's reputation for Socialistic leanings frightened holders into selling their stock, though the extent to which this happened was probably quite insignificant, and the force of the movement, if it had any, has long ago spent itself. Still, it is undoubtedly a fact that in the early days of the rule of the present Ministry a few investors sold their Consols in fear of Socialism; and it is another fact—and an infinitely diverting one—that some of them solemnly put the money realised by the sale of Socialistically tainted Consols into the loans of certain Australasian colonies, in which most of the tendencies and ideals which are here damned as Socialism are in the full swing of paramount predominance.

To this very limited extent, then, those who used the fall in Consols as a stick to beat the Government withal may be said to have been justified. But the connexion of the fall in London County Council Stock with the Moderate victory was a profound and wholly baseless absurdity, as anyone who knows anything of City opinion will abundantly testify.

Thus advertised by sensational journalism and political dialectics, the 'low price' of Consols became a nine days' wonder which agitated men's minds until the fine weather of the Easter holidays turned them into another direction, more especially as after Easter Consols went up again a little, though no intimation had been received that the Government had become less Socialistic. Nevertheless, now that the clamour has ceased, it may be worth while to consider quietly

whether the phenomenon which caused it was so very terrible, and also how it came about.

The first conclusion arrived at by a dispassionate observer of the price of Consols during its spasms at the end of March, is that it was not low at all. Relatively, of course, and to us, accustomed to the higher level of former years, it looked low; but viewed broadly and simply, and apart from predilection, the price was a flattering testimony to the value of British credit. The lowest point officially recorded was 84¼, and at 84 the yield to the buyer would only have been 2*l.* 19*s.* 6⅞*d.* per cent.; so that, even at the level which caused all the blood-curdling and recrimination, anyone who had put his money into Consols would have been making an investment which would have brought him in less than 3 per cent. on his money, and that from a security which, owing to its prominent position as a political barometer, is particularly volatile and jumpy.

There was no other country in the world to which investors were then prepared to pay this flattering unction, of buying its debts at prices which yielded them less than 3 per cent.[1] The price of United States bonds, as has frequently been pointed out, is not a relevant comparison, since it is artificially enhanced by the regulation which makes them the basis of note issue by the American banks. But French Rentes, the hoarded treasure of our thrifty friends across the Channel, stood, being a 3 per cent. stock, at 94, yielding nearly 3*l.* 4*s.* per cent. at the price, at the very time when the sun of England's credit was supposed to be setting, though so much more highly priced.

The comparison between Consols now and at the last date at which they touched 84 is, of course, absurdly unscientific and misleading, owing to the simple fact that they are now quite a different article. Then they represented a promise on behalf of the British Government to pay the holder 3*l.* a year; now they represent its promise to pay 2*l.* 10*s.* a year. If we really compare like with like, we see at once that 84 for a 2½ per cent. stock means something over par for the old Threes. Thus we begin to discover that at a time of severe and prolonged monetary strain, culminating in a landslide in the prices of American shares in Wall Street which threatened world-wide destruction, British credit was still priced at a value which made an investment in Consols much too dear a luxury to be contemplated by any but the most fastidious investor, prepared to pay through the nose for the pleasure of feeling that he is buying the most expensive stock in the world. If our savings are to be placed in a security which yields less than 3 per cent., the incentive to save, to any but the most thrifty souls, becomes sensibly lessened, and now that the

[1] The apparent exception provided by the Greek Two-and-a-Half per Cent. Guaranteed Loan does not count. There is no market in the stock, and its quotation is quite nominal. Moreover, it owes its price purely to its guarantee by Great Britain.

investor's choice has been so immeasurably widened by the creation of new securities and the breaking-down of old tradition, the maintenance of Consols at such a wholly unattractive level, during the stressful times through which the City has been passing, is a compliment to British credit which is literally marvellous in the depth of its flattery and sincerity.

And not only were Consols astonishingly dear at a time when their low price was supposed to be another headline in that handwriting on the wall which the Dr. Browns of to-day are so fond of tracing, but there were plenty of excellent reasons why they should have been cheap, and if we review a few of the most notable of them, we shall be yet more impressed by the serene dignity with which Consols have succeeded in ignoring them.

The old tradition, referred to above, of a prejudice in favour of Consols as the only possible investment for a respectable family, was a very real influence on the market price in the days before the conversion, but since then it has undoubtedly been weakened almost to vanishing-point. It does not for a moment follow from this fact that the conversion was a mistake. Conversion, by means of which the British nation offered holders of the greater part of its debt the option of being paid off or of accepting 2¾ per cent. and ultimately 2½ per cent. interest, saved the country so many millions a year, and the great financier whose name will always be associated with it would smile if he could now hear some of the criticisms of his momentous operation which have been evoked of late because the price of Consols is lower than superficial skimmers of monetary news have been accustomed to expect. If Lord Goschen could have foreseen the present situation of the international money market and its effect on the prices of all securities with a fixed yield, far from being deterred from his conversion scheme he would have carried it out with all the more conviction and determination. For the mere fact that it would now, owing to the subsequent progress of monetary affairs, have been impossible, is in itself sufficient proof of the opportuneness and economy of the operation. Holders of Consols, who have seen their incomes reduced and the capital value of their securities fall, are naturally inclined to maintain that the conversion was a blunder, if not a crime; but the custodian of the nation's finances is chiefly concerned to make arrangements by which its debt shall be served as cheaply as possible and redeemed as rapidly as possible. And both these ends have been furthered by Lord Goschen's conversion.

Nevertheless, though the criticisms which have been showered on the conversion in the light of recent events are based chiefly on a notion, for which disinterested reflection can discover little reasonable basis, that Consols are an article which ought to be priced at about par, and that nothing should be done which can interfere with their being so, there can be no doubt that it did upset the belief, at one

time quite prevalent, that they were the only possible investment for decent families. The leaven of doubt on the point worked slowly but steadily; at first it took the form of restraining the good old habit by which trustees, as a matter of course, put trust funds into Consols. A trustee who by taking a little thought could find within the four corners of the Acts which regulated his choice of investments securities which yielded a higher rate than Consols, might well be excused from bothering about the matter as long as Consols yielded 3 per cent. to the beneficiaries under the trust. When this was no longer so, it behoved him, if he had a conscience, to pick and choose and find something cheaper, and so Consols got the cold shoulder from an important class of investors.

The process was accelerated by a curious combination of circumstances which, as we shall see later, forced the prices of all trustee investments to prices which now, as we look back across the past decade, seem wholly preposterous, but in those days had rather the appearance of having come to stay. If it had not been for this coincidence it may be doubted whether the conversion would have had much effect in frightening off the class of investors referred to above; for without this extraordinary appreciation of securities with a fixed yield, which arose from the extraordinary abundance of what is called 'money,' the price of Consols would naturally have responded to the conversion by settling down to something like its present level, so that the trustee and the fastidious investor might still have bought them to pay them a return on the capital sunk which would not have been wholly unattractive, though the activity of Sinking Fund and Savings Bank purchases would in any case have been formidable competitors.

But the two processes worked together in a manner which was extremely unsettling. The reduction of interest and the high price to which Consols and other trustee securities were forced, first of all made trustees and investors who preferred to be guided by the Trustees Acts in selecting their stocks, pick and choose among the stocks covered by the Acts, taking those which gave the highest yield; this demand was readily followed by a very rapid creation of municipal stocks, but the supply did not for a long time overtake it, since it was enhanced by the competition of an operator whose activities will be considered later—namely, the speculator in gilt-edged securities, who bought them in blocks and pawned them at the astonishingly cheap rates for money that were current in the years 1895 and 1896.

A new device was then introduced to save trust funds from the fate of being invested at prices which only yielded about 2½ per cent.; trust deeds began to be drawn less strictly, and the straight path imposed on trustees by the provisions of the Acts was widened by the terms of the deeds, which contained powers which sometimes gave practically unlimited range of selection. The responsibility and

difficulty of the trustee's thankless task was thus greatly increased, and a great breach was made in the ancient earthworks of financial convention, when it began to dawn on certain classes of investors that no absolute sanctity was attached to the provisions of the Trustees Acts, and that securities which were not marked by their approval were nevertheless quite possible as holdings for a respectable and well-behaved citizen.

This change of sentiment would of itself have sufficed to make some difference to the price of trustee securities. If a large body of steady and devoted port drinkers suddenly discover that claret is cheaper, and wholesome and sound enough for their internal economy, the price of port must suffer. And still more so if exceptionally big vintages increase its supply, as was the case with trustee stocks. For, besides the rapid creation of municipal securities already referred to, their number was multiplied, first by the inclusion of colonial stocks, as a practical mark of Imperialist enthusiasm, then by the South African War, with its big increase in the amount of Consols and other Government securities, accompanied by a slackening in the activity of the Sinking Fund, and finally by the Irish Land Purchase Scheme, and the creation of a special stock to be issued in instalments to supply the necessary funds.

Trustee stocks, including their leader, Consols, were thus rapidly multiplied at a time when the height of their prices had already broken down the tradition that had restricted many investors to their purchase. And when, consequently, their prices began to fall, their unpopularity was only increased, because holders saw, with surprise that did little credit to their intelligence, that by buying Consols and trustee stocks they had not guarded themselves against the possibility of diminished capital value. Of course, they ought to have known that there is nothing in the world that a man can buy with the certainty of being able to sell it again at the same price; but the delusion that this impossible attribute was attached to Consols and its gilt-edged satellites appears to have been astonishingly general. A letter was published some time ago in an evening paper, in which a holder of Consols poured out the bitterness of his feelings on the point by saying that Government stocks had shown themselves wanting in the one quality for which he had bought and cherished them—namely, security. As there appeared to be every reason to expect that the interest on the British debt would be punctually met, the statement was at first sight startling; but it was explained by the rest of the letter, which showed that when the writer talked about security, all that he meant was stability in price, which is a horse of quite another colour. The security of Consols, which means the probability that the interest will be met duly, has not altered one jot; but many holders were undoubtedly shocked by the discovery that their price could move downwards as well as upwards.

It may be remarked, in passing, that the ordinary or private holder of a security which is absolutely secure is only adding to the unnecessary worries of life by fashing himself about the price of it in the market. The safety of his income is all that need concern him, and if the price goes down, there will be less estate duty for his executors to find. For banks and other companies which hold gilt-edged securities the case is altered; they have to show their securities in their balance-sheets, and the writing-down process that is involved by their fall sometimes bites an uncomfortably large slice out of net revenue profits.

The private investor, however, seems to persist in preferring to see his stocks standing at a higher price than they cost him, oblivious of the fact that thereby they make the process of further investment dearer; and though it is unwise to generalise too positively concerning the action of the large and heterogeneous body that buys securities, there is good reason to believe that the fall in the prices of the stocks which had hitherto been regarded as unimpeachable, quickened the rapidity of the process by which they were being abandoned in favour of a more extended circle of investments. Those who had been early in the field were able to point out to their friends that by widening their horizon they had increased their incomes and acquired steadier securities, for the new-fangled stocks which were coming into fashion, not being subjected to the many causes which had depressed Consols and other trustee securities, being, moreover, held up by the new demand for them, and also being, as will be shown, less sensitive to the influence of a hardening money market, had shown the quality of stability, the lack of which was so bitterly charged against the former corner-stones of the investor's temple.

Thus the process continued with gathering force, and it gradually became to some extent a common practice, not only to refrain from buying trustee stocks, except in cases where there was no choice, but actually to sell them and reinvest the proceeds in securities of a higher yield. The movement, of course, has been attended with some danger, especially if carried out without the help of the best expert advice, but the world-wide prosperity that has lately ruled has so far prevented the roving tendency of the modern investor from landing him in serious danger, and as long as he is careful to distribute his risks, and applies caution and a critical eye to the selection of his stocks, it is possible that the extent to which he has shaken off the chains of old tradition may not do him much damage.

Another influence which tended in the same direction was the popularity of Japanese loans at and after the time of the Russo-Japanese war, and the profits that have accrued to those investors who backed Japanese credit at its time of trial. Investments in the bonds of foreign Governments had previously been long unfashionable, and though the Chinese loans, issued after the earlier Far Eastern war, had been taken up readily here, the security of the Maritime

Customs on which they had been based put these issues into a slightly different category. The success of the Japanese issues recalled the attention of investors to a forgotten field, and with such effect that in spite of old-standing political prejudice, and the many uncertainties of Russian politics, a Russian loan was offered last year in London and met with a quite satisfactory reception. The British prejudice in favour of registered stocks, as opposed to the bearer bonds in which foreign loans are habitually issued, is rapidly dying, and the international nature of the market in them makes them easily negotiable. 'Foreigners' are thus returning steadily to favour with the British investor, and another important band of competitors has thus been added to those which had already done so much to seduce him from his allegiance to the financial gods of his fathers.

Here we have reasons enough and to spare to account for the fall in Consols; and yet the most important of all has not yet been mentioned, or has only been alluded to casually. I have left it out as long as I could because disquisitions on the price of money are probably the dullest and least intelligible stuff—to any but the expert, and to him they are stale and unprofitable—that can be put before a reader.

Nevertheless, it has to be tackled at last, for it not only goes further to account for the recent fall in Consols than any of the considerations set out above, but it also answers a question which has been clamouring for a reply ever since this discussion of their price was begun. For if it be true, as herein asserted, that the price of Consols is still high, and was high even when its apparent lowness was providing the sensation of the moment, some explanation is obviously required of the causes which forced it to the very much higher level of 1896 and 1897, in both of which years it was within a hair's-breadth of 114. It was then, of course, a $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. stock; but even so the comparison between that price and the recent figure of 84 odd for the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. makes it difficult to accept the statement that Consols are now high, unless it can be shown that a decade ago their position was wholly abnormal.

It was wholly abnormal because the position of the money market was wholly abnormal, and the price of Consols, like that of every other security with a fixed yield, must depend, ultimately and in the long run, on the value of money—that is to say, on the rate of interest current in the money market—more than on any other individual influence. The causes already enumerated, such as the widening of the trustee's powers, the change of sentiment with regard to investments, and the multiplication of trustee investments, all have their effect; but that of the price of money is the most potent of all. Political influences, too, have a temporary effect, but that is only another way of saying the same thing; for if international difficulties are apprehended, money-lenders are always in a hurry to button

up their pockets, and the price of money rises while that of securities falls. The state of the money market is the ultimate and most important factor. When money is scarce and dear, and its fortunate possessors can earn 3½ per cent. merely by leaving it on deposit at their banks, there is obviously little inducement to invest it in securities of a low yield, and subject to fluctuations in price.

When money is a drug, as they say in the City, when the Bank rate is 2 per cent. and the interest on Bank deposits is 1 per cent., the rush to invest funds in securities will obviously be persistent.

Now, the conditions of the money market in the period 1895 and 1896 were marked by wholly abnormal cheapness. Not only did the Bank rate remain at 2 per cent. for a quite unprecedented period (from February 1894 to September 1896, to be precise), but it was so far above the rates for money current in the market that among the many revolutionary proposals produced by that record-breaking period of monetary abundance—which included a suggestion for the demonetisation of gold—it was urged that the Bank rate ought to be reduced below 2 per cent. For in those days it was common experience to find that the price of day-to-day money—that is to say, loans from bankers to bill brokers at call—ruled at 5*s.* per cent. per annum, and bills were at that time discounted in Lombard Street at 10*s.* per cent. per annum. These rates look absurd and incredible now, but they were real facts then; and, what is more, they were so real that there was no apparent reason why they should not be lasting, and in fact Lombard Street began to despair of ever seeing 3 per cent. again.

As to the causes of this remarkable phenomenon, much might be said, but happily the exigencies of space forbid lengthy inquiry into them. It was generally attributed in those days to the increase in the supply of gold, the annual output of which was doubled in the period 1886 to 1896. Subsequent monetary history has, in its quiet, inexorable manner, put an extinguisher on the flame of this argument; for the annual output of gold has been doubled again in the past decade, and yet it has witnessed a change in the money market from exaggerated ease to exaggerated stringency. So, though it is obviously true that an increase in the supply of gold tends to make the money market easy, since the supply of credit is based, roughly and more or less, on the quantity of gold held by banks, it has been shown that this tendency can be counteracted by other influences. The truth of the matter lies, as usual, in a combination of circumstances; in 1886 to 1896 the effect of the increase in the supply of gold was assisted by a pause in industrial and agricultural development, owing to crises of one kind and another that overtook the countries which were then making most rapid material progress—namely, Argentina, Australia, and the United States—and also by the very low prices of

raw materials which their opening up and that of other new countries had caused, with the help of cheaper and quicker transport.

This same cheapness of commodities has also been attributed wholly to the increased output of gold; but here, again, the experience of the last decade, in which increased gold has been accompanied by higher prices of commodities, shows that the supply of gold is only one factor among many, and that the others may predominate. The experience of the past two decades, in fact, looks rather as if the price of commodities was the most important factor of all in the money market. In the first decade Mr. Sauerbeck's Index Number, an ingenious device which expresses the value of all the chief commodities in one figure, fell to 60, and money became a drug; in the second, the Index Number rose to 80, and money became scarce to the point of famine. Now, we must be careful to avoid the mistake of thinking that because two economic facts happen together they are therefore cause and effect and will always happen together, lest the experience of the next decade should again intervene with an extinguisher. Nevertheless, trade makes such heavy drafts on credit at all times, and the drafts that it makes are so obviously less or greater according to the price of the commodities that it handles, and wants to have financed on credit until they are worked up and sold, that the connexion between the Index Number and the price of Consols must certainly be to some extent constant, though varying according to the presence of other influences. For example, the price of copper has risen, roughly, from 50*l.* per ton to 100*l.* Consequently a merchant and manufacturer who is carrying 100 tons of copper on credit, with a view to resale or use in the workshop, requires 10,000*l.* from his banker instead of 5,000*l.* And the effect is obvious on the supply of credit, and so on the price of money, and so on the price of Consols.

We have thus arrived at the conclusion that the sky-rocket rise in Consols which culminated in 1896 was due chiefly to the wholly abnormal cheapness of credit at that time, which drove holders of money to invest it in securities rather than employ it in Lombard Street, and that this cheapness of credit was largely due to a pause in trade development and the low price of commodities, both of which factors set free more money to go into the Consols market. Another important influence must be mentioned, which also accounts for a phenomenon to which sinister importance has been attached by recent commentators on the price of Consols—namely, the fact that the fall in Consols has been more severe than in other leading securities such as French Rente. The highest price touched by French 3 per cent. Rente in the period of abnormally high prices was 103, and at the time when Consols were at 84¼, French Rente was 94. But to account for this greater stability of the French article we have not only the fact that there has been no reduction in their rate of interest, no

slackening in Sinking Fund activity as in the case of Consols, and no big new creations as the result of war, but also there is the important consideration that French Rente was not forced up so high by the activity of the speculative buyer.

Speculation in gilt-edged securities was encouraged in London to an extent that could not be imitated elsewhere by the wonderfully elastic machinery of London's credit system, which made it an easy matter, in those days of cheap and abundant money, for operators to buy Consols and pawn them as security with bankers, who were only too glad to make use of their funds at quite nominal rates. As long as money could be borrowed for this purpose at 1½ per cent., there was a nice clear profit on the mere difference between the rate paid for the loan and the yield on the stock; and as the tendency of Consols was then upward, there was the further temptation of a big profit from the rise. The opportunity was taken very largely, especially by bill brokers and other dealers in credit, who found it difficult to earn profits, in those abnormal times, in the ordinary course of their business. For the purpose of this kind of operation first-class British securities were preferred, as being more readily lent against, and with narrower margins, by bankers, and here we see yet another reason why Consols and their stable companions of the 'gilt-edged' market were especially affected by the period of cheap money, being pushed up in price by the speculative lever, only to come down more rapidly when this lever was withdrawn, when money became dear.

Such were the conditions which screwed Consols up to 114—abnormally cheap money, a pause in trade development, low prices of commodities, and the effect of Sinking Fund purchases. For their subsequent relapse, ample reasons have already been given: a change of fashion in investment, brought about to a great extent by the very fact of the impossible price to which Consols had risen, the widening of trustees' powers, new creations of stock in the course of the war, the slackening of Sinking Fund purchases, the reduction in the rate paid on them, and, finally, active trade all over the world, high prices of commodities, and a period of acute monetary stringency caused by this very activity of trade and high price of materials, and culminating in a 6 per cent. Bank rate, imposed last October. Development, in fact, was so active, and the world-wide craving for capital was so eager and importunate, that it was evident that something had to give somewhere.

New York gave accordingly. Development in the United States had strained most things to breaking-point. There was so much production that the railroads could not handle the traffic, so many orders that manufacturers could not cope with them, so much competition for labour that workers could not be found, and such pressure for credit that 'time-money,' as it is there called, was not to be had

at a price. During January and February the railroads of the United States rammed down the mouth of an already glutted market a bolus in the shape of 40,000,000*l.* short-dated notes and 60,000,000*l.* of new stock. The result was a fit of indigestion which doubled Wall Street up and left it prostrate, and griped all the markets of the financially civilised world with more or less severity.

The spasm was faced with an amount of equanimity which does infinite credit to the power of modern finance to turn an awkward corner without losing its balance. Not a failure was announced in New York; but then it is not part of New York's system to announce failures. 'When a man is cleaned out,' an American once explained, 'we don't let him fail; we take him into a corner and take away all his clothes, give him an old newspaper to cover his nakedness, and leave him.'

In London, where matters are arranged differently, half a dozen quite unimportant failures marked the extent of the declared damage. But the state of the City at the end of March was far from comfortable, and loose-tongued rumour, as usual, did its best to make the worst of matters. It will be long before the experiences of that time are forgotten. That Consols, under the pressure of all these influences, some of them insidious and persistent like a slow poison, others blatant and sudden as an avalanche, should, even so, not have fallen to the point at which they yield 3 per cent. to the buyer, is an achievement of which British credit has every right to be proud.

HARTLEY WITHERS.

WHAT TO DRINK

THE question of alcohol, whether it be beneficial to man or injurious to him, is one that cannot be too frequently brought under notice. For, unfortunately, the general public has arrived at a conviction—comfortable, perhaps, but erroneous—that if what people are pleased to call moderation be practised, alcohol, taken daily, though no need of stimulation be felt, not only does no harm, but may even do good. But as 'moderation' is a word which means one thing to this man or woman and another thing to that, we are in presence of an important difficulty; for alcohol is admitted by everybody to be a powerful drug. And even if we could lay down definitely what amount of alcohol per day would constitute moderation, we should not, I fear, have advanced very far towards bettering the large percentage of the population which is being injured by it. Every man would still be a law unto himself. Scientific argument is of little avail. On this subject those who are convinced are usually convinced against their will, and, as we know, 'are of the same opinion still'; or act as if they were. But I have known many persons who have been led to give their judgment against the daily dietetic use of this powerful drug—upon whom argument produced no effect whatever—by means of some very simple and common-sense considerations regarding it.

You point to a plant in a flower-pot. It is looking somewhat dried up. In want of water, you say. Yes; the food is all right. There is plenty of good-looking clay in the pot. But liquid is needed so to dissolve the food as to enable the roots to carry it into the circulation of the plant. Water alone will not do, nor will clay alone do. There must be both. Now, it will occur to the reader that the natural solvent for carrying the food of all animals into the circulation is water; and it may occur to him (as to the persons of whom I have spoken) that probably nothing else will do as well. A trial will show that if he give a plant alcohol mixed with water it will fade away and die. And I may say here, that though animal tissues are not plant tissues, the insurance companies take a similar view of its effect on man: for they lay down that the man who habitually takes alcohol even in moderation must not be insured at the favourable rates which are allowed to abstainers from it. It is a point worth pondering that we find com-

mittees of level-headed business men coming to a very definite conclusion on this alcohol question from the point of view of their financial interests. Surely, you will say, there must be something in it. And of course there is. There is reason and common-sense in it. For, the effect of alcohol on the tissues is to harden them, and, after the earlier effects pass off, to impede (though to a slight extent) the circulation in them. As it destroys the power of the plant to feed, so it acts, though in a lesser degree, in diminishing the desire for food in the human subject. Less food is capable of being assimilated, and therefore less is desired. Indeed, less food is capable of being digested in the stomach; for as alcohol hardens the tissues of the body, it hardens the food it mixes with in the digestive tract, rendering it difficult of solution and digestion. The capricious appetite of regular alcohol takers is well known, and is thus easily accounted for. We do not associate a hardening process with life, or the manifestations of life. On the contrary, we associate these manifestations with elasticity, plasticity, softness. As a hardening agent for preserving pathological specimens alcohol is excellent, but why become a hardened pathological specimen before your time by pouring it down your throat?

Common-sense, then, is on the side of the view that the animal body is, let us say, *a machine to be worked by water*. Sir Benjamin Richardson used to say that we can see at once the absurdity of using for our steam engines a liquid unadapted to their construction, and that our mistake is soon seen if we put the water where the oil, and the oil where the water, ought to be. The point is that the machine must be altered if you would have it work under new conditions. And so, if we proceed to work the animal machine with a liquid which is not natural to it, we, as a matter of course, commence a process of altering the machine to meet the new requirements. For, unlike the lifeless engine, the animal body *does* endeavour to adapt itself to the changed conditions; but, unfortunately, these conditions, not being physiological, entail the setting up of processes which are not physiological but pathological—in other words, disease processes. All that may seem an exaggeration in view of general experience, but in reality it is not so.

What had we better do, then, with a drug a very slight overdose of which produces headache, mental confusion, redness of eyes, loss of appetite, indigestion? Evidently abandon its habitual use, not its occasional use when a stimulant to the circulation is suddenly required. For it is as certain as the insurance companies make it that the habitual use of alcohol in sufficient quantity to produce a stimulant effect (short of which few people want to take it at all) is an outrage on Nature, disturbs her processes of assimilation of food and of nutrition, and induces in time a morbid condition of the lungs, liver, kidneys, and brain.

But objectors have, of course, something to say. And they will be quite in earnest when they tell us that this is an exaggerated picture. The alcohol they take, they will say, does not hurt them. But a few further considerations will appear which may give them pause. If an objector have read so far he will have had one more opportunity of noting that when he is taking alcohol he is adding something to his blood which was never intended to be there of necessity—something foreign and injurious to it—and I have good hope that that knowledge may lead him to, at all events, limit carefully the quantity he adds to it. Undoubtedly, objections have to be met. Are there not numbers of our acquaintances who habitually take a considerable quantity of alcohol in one beverage or another who, nevertheless, do not seem to suffer for it? That is certainly so. But it is only seeming. The capacity of such persons for work, and their general enjoyment of life, would be much enhanced if only they did without it as a rule—admitting of the exception of which I have spoken. Moreover, that desirable feeling of zest and satisfaction in work, to which they are now strangers, would take the place of the sense of effort and fatigue brought about by very ordinary tasks. For the fact is, their constitutional powers are being used in efforts to eliminate the more or less of alcoholic poison they have ingested. The power of the body to eliminate poisons is very great; but the effort is not made on the part of the excretory organs without damage to them, and steady loss of this power. It is not merely a case of extraordinary work thrown on them, but unnatural work; and I need not argue that what is unnatural is necessarily injurious. Just consider what happens when the eliminating powers are a bit overtaxed. So polluted (the word is the right one) is the blood circulating in the delicate brain tissue, so congested are the cerebral vessels, that the head aches as if splitting; or, even, a state of fever is induced, necessitating days or weeks of medical treatment, during which the ordinary exercise and food of the body are intermitted, damage done to the constitution, and life unquestionably shortened. But, short of this manifest overtaxing of the eliminating organs, it is plain that the energies of the body are being employed in a wrong direction; and the capacity for work is lessened in proportion to the degree of the abnormal call on the bodily powers for the elimination of alcohol. Oxidation is going on under difficulties.

But are we to proclaim that alcohol is absolutely and entirely pernicious, because these things are so? Assuredly not. For what is this alcohol trouble? The trouble is that while there are occasions for the use of alcohol, it is most generally used when there is no occasion for it. Moreover, when there is occasion for it, and the prescribed quantity of it has had the desired effect, the patient does not crave for more; while if taken when not required the tendency of alcohol is to create a desire for more of it, and this because some constitutional

irritation produced by the first dose, though in a certain sense pleasurable, needs to be allayed. There are states, of which medical men know, in which certain regulated doses of alcohol are beneficial. The same is true of every other powerful drug. The notion that it is a food, to be taken every day as a matter of course, is a wholly pernicious one. People who are in health do not add to that state by taking wines or spirits. The bodies of the lower animals are maintained in vigorous health without them, a fact which disposes of the contention that the alcohol they contain is to be regarded as a necessary part of one's daily food. Alcohol is not a food. It is a poison, useful, like other poisons, in its due place. 'Infirmities' of which St. Paul spoke may call for it; and the Book of Proverbs advises the giving of strong drink to a man who is 'ready to perish,' for urgent need, and of 'wine to him who is of heavy heart.' These are occasions, however, of more or less urgent distress, which, once tided over, no longer need the remedy. Here in England we may assuredly say that without alcohol

> Life would be longer,
> Hearts would be stronger.

F. A. Davy, M.D.,
Lieut.-Col. late R.A.M.C.

IDLE READING

THE austere housewife who called reading 'idle work' may have been unconscious of the oxymoron. But she uttered a profound truth all the same. There are popular authors it would be invidious to name who would apparently rather write than read. Most people would rather talk than do either. Of such was George Henry Lewes, who used, however, to say that when he was too much tired to read German he would read French, and when he was too much tired to read French he would still read English. An academic sciolist proud of his library was once showing off his shelves and bindings to a friend. 'I hardly know what to do with all these books,' he said. 'Read them, my dear fellow,' replied the candid visitor. There is a frame of mind, happily rare, in which printed words seem, like the hatter's remarks to Alice, to have no sort of meaning, although they are certainly English. Mere trash, compared by Mr. Goldwin Smith with bad tobacco, kills time and spoils taste. 'Idle work' is something more than that. It implies occupation without effort, and what else can be so agreeable? Reading for a purpose absorbs, engrosses, becomes in time an overmastering passion. But reading without a purpose is not altogether purposeless. The search for suggestion is a real pursuit. When Mrs. Glasse said in her cookery book that the first thing was to catch your hare, she had not really got to the beginning. You must start your hare before you can do anything else with it, and how many hares are started by idle reading! I don't mean such improving form of sport as looking out the references in Macaulay. Thackeray has an eloquent passage on the infinite possibilities involved in this method. But perhaps it could hardly be called idle, and in some cases it might be almost as difficult as verifying the numerous quotations in *Hamlet*, or proving that Milton borrowed without acknowledgment from a Dutchman. Dr. Johnson resolutely protested against the popular fallacy that you should begin at the beginning of a book. There was no knowing where that fatal theory might not land you. You might even feel bound to read to the end. Which is absurd.

Only a proposition of Euclid, and perhaps a sonnet, requires to be taken as a whole. A great many people say, 'The world is too much

with us,' without being able to go any further, and without in the least meaning it as far as it goes. But such a use of poetry cannot be seriously defended. Without adopting the standard of Professor Raleigh, which is the true one, and considering Wordsworth as a whole, we may agree that to quote 'Milton, thou shouldst be living at this hour' is not really to show a knowledge of him. I saw the other day attributed to Shakespeare the surprising statement that 'Orpheus with his lute made trees,' which reminded me of the famous text, 'Hear the Church,' and Archbishop Whately's characteristic comment, 'I should like that gentleman to preach on "Hang all the law and the prophets."' One is quite as much in the Bible as the other. Even the idlest reading may serve to show the proper context of a common tag, to prove, for instance, that the author of a great poem never wrote such nonsense as 'alone in his glory.' Then what did he write? Go and read the *Burial of Sir John Moore*, if you do not know it by heart, and you will see.

Perhaps essays should be placed in the same category as propositions and sonnets! I mean true essays, not reviews, or long historical discourses. No one would begin one of Bacon's essays in the middle, though he might be pulled up by a sentence too full of meaning to be appreciated without idle thought. And Hume's essays are so artistically simple that they carry you on like a yacht on a smooth lake. But the normal essay, such as Hazlitt's for example, is open to the objection that it cannot be skipped, being all of a piece, one and indivisible like the French Republic, or a scientific atom. A good novel read for the first time is another instance. Even Johnson sat up through the night to read *Evelina*, which would send many people to sleep in the daytime now. After the first time skipping is of course easy, unless the book be one of those superlatively excellent performances which should be read once for the plot, a second time for the characters, and a third time for the style. We have heard perhaps too much of the sage who declared with offensive, and obviously mendacious priggishness, that whenever a new book came out he read an old one. 'When I want to read a book, I write one,' said the more humorous Disraeli, who in his youth had been a great reader of other people's works. Disraeli could certainly make a book out of very unpromising materials. Even a French cook might stand aghast at the *Life of Lord George Bentinck*. That singular volume, without a parallel in our literature, lends itself to idle reading, though it was by no means idly written. It is hard reading that the easy writing makes. The best of idle reading is that you cannot tell beforehand what will come of it. The course of the hare is beyond human prediction. There is no argument, there is not even pure Latinity, in the words of St. Augustine which converted Newman to Roman Catholicism. The result was not less surprising than the consequence of Saul's quest for his father's

asses, which profited, if they cared for desolate freedom, by the sudden preference of the Israelites for monarchical institutions. A tomb at Lucca, I think, altered the whole tenor of Ruskin's life, and he read tombs as idly as other people read books. Ruskin did not altogether like the effect of his lucubrations upon the idle reader. He confessed with sorrow that he had caused a large number of entirely worthless individuals to take an interest in art. What he wanted, good man, was to teach political economy. But idle people will not learn political economy, and the others would not learn it from Ruskin.

The idle reader does not by the hypothesis want to learn. It by no means follows that he always escapes that mental process. Is there a book better suited to the idle reader than *Tristram Shandy*? Is there any place where the law of association must be so inevitably, and man be so idly learnt? Just think of Mrs. Shandy's many-coloured wardrobe passing in procession through the mind of Susanna when she hears of Bobby's death. Why should the idle reader trouble himself with Locke? He does not read, bless him, to think, but to be saved the trouble of thinking. How grateful we are, consciously or otherwise, to the authors who do us this service. We cannot be always leading the strenuous life. The mind must sometimes lie fallow, and then one turns with relief to a new friend from the circulating library, vivid and not exacting, like Mr. Wells, or an old friend, whose pet phrases are household words, like Matthew Arnold. Take down *Essays in Criticism*, the worn brown volume that we handled so reverently when we were young. Never mind the obvious faults, the tricks, the repetitions, the affected turns of phrase. Soak your mind in the noble enthusiasm for literature, the scholar's instinct for what is best, the happy quotations, the happier humour, the clearness and preciseness of thought. Can there be an idler, or a pleasanter task than to read in that limpid English why we are not a critical nation, why we seem unintelligent to the French, what a set of Philistines we are, or were, how much we want an Academy, or at least how many errors we should be spared if we had one. Whether Matthew Arnold was right or wrong, is not the question. The point is that he saves his readers all trouble, talks to them, entertains them, thinks for them, sends them on their way rejoicing. He was an inspector of schools, and had learnt so well how to be understood by children that he was never obscure to grown-up people. There ought surely to be books for tired minds, and *Essays in Criticism* is one of them, not because there is no thought in it, but because the author thinks for the reader. He may have been dogmatic, but for idle reading give me a dogmatist. I do not in such moods like to be argued with, I like to be told. Even if one does not exactly know what 'prose of the centre' is, nor how Matthew Arnold came to be an infallible judge of it, one can put up with the authoritative pronouncement that Bossuet could write it, if one is given a sample

of his wares. How did Bossuet come by such a style? Why could he not come by larger ideas? What is style? Did Pascal make the French language out of Montaigne, or out of nothing, or at all? These are the sort of vague surmises on which idle reading floats one. Like index learning, they turn no student pale. They do not make the weakest head ache. They do not excite, but in the good old sense of the word they amuse. If you are seriously and soberly earnest, you should compare like with like, not the best passages of Bossuet with the worst passages of Burke, or the best of Clarendon with the worst of Macaulay. But the idle reader does not want you to be soberly and seriously earnest. Very likely an English Academy would have excluded Burke on account of his occasional grossness. Would they have been right? It is easy to say 'No.' Much fun, some of it very good fun, has been made of the French Academy. How delicious is

> Ci-y gît Piron, qui ne fut rien,
> Pas même Académicien.

Yet the French Academy has lost none of its reputation since Cardinal Richelieu founded it in 1635. It has imposed upon Frenchmen a respect for their own language which we have not for ours, free and independent Britons that we are. Even the idle reader, or perhaps I should say especially the idle reader, is affected by style. He may even ask himself whether Matthew Arnold always wrote 'prose of the centre,' and whether the 'note of provinciality' is not to be found even in him.

I am told that very few people nowadays read Sir Arthur Helps. That profound thinkers, always on the mental stretch, should avoid him I can understand. He did not invent platitudes, and call them paradoxes, as seems to be rather the fashion at the present time. But if *Friends in Council* are idle, they are very easy reading. They do not tax what pedants call the ratiocinative powers. They do not send one to the map, or to the dictionary, or to the manual of useful knowledge. Milverton is apt to be long-winded, and Ellesmere's sarcasm is sometimes rather cheap. Cheap? No, that is a vulgar word. And the great charm of the friends is that they are free from all vulgarity. Dignity, and mutual respect, are qualities of the house in which they meet, as of themselves. If they are rather too well informed, and rather too well behaved, those are faults on the right side. Hysteria is not genius, and one can talk effectively without screaming. No one ever read *Friends in Council* for a sensation, or an examination. But the idle reader is in search neither of facts nor of feelings. He wants to pass the time without being too acutely conscious that he is wasting it. No very exalted ideal, perhaps. Yet who can say how many trains of thought have been thus unconsciously laid? Even knowledge is not always communicated by thumps. A good book, even a moderately good book, has different meanings

for different readers. Delicacy and urbanity find many ways into the soul, some of them by back doors. It is impossible to be too methodical when one has an aim. When one has no aim, like old Montaigne, who wrote to please himself, or because he could not help it, method is out of place. The idle reader disregards opinions. Whether he agrees, or disagrees, with the author, is all one to him. Even the subject is comparatively unimportant. He asks only one question, Is the book readable? What makes a book readable? Charles Lamb boldly denied the epithet to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall.* But that, like Coleridge's metaphysics, was only his fun. Still, Gibbon is not altogether for the idle reader, except in the priceless Autobiography. He is too consecutive, although there are gems, not merely in the notes, which repay the idlest perusal, as when two rival theologians submitted to the ordeal by fire, and the spectators were astonished at finding that the impartial flames consumed both the disputants. Nothing could altogether assuage the levity of the great historian, whose own 'invincible love of reading' he would not, he said, exchange for 'the wealth of the Indies.' One can hardly think of him, however, as reading idly. He read for the great object of his life. Charles Lamb must have been the prince of idle readers, as he certainly wrote for them, and wrote his best. We may be sure that Lamb never read anything he disliked, and he was entirely unaffected by conventional judgments. If Shakespeare or Milton had bored him, he would have said so, though we can scarcely conceive his joining Dr. Johnson and Hannah More in their inquiry why Milton's sonnets were so bad. Lamb was an incomparable reader. He read everything that suited him, and nothing else, so that he never suffered from intellectual dyspepsia. The idle reader has at least the courage to be guided by his own taste. He goes his own way, taking what pleases him, following the line of least resistance into very pleasant places, ensnared by flowers, falling on grass. An idle reader need not be an idle man. Most idle men do not read at all. To go to sleep over a book is no crime. Sydney Smith recommended his own sermons as an unfailing soporific, and it need not be a bad book that produces this particular form of harmony with one's environment. A contented mood facilitates slumber, and what better frame of mind can a writer hope to induce?

The idle reader sometimes lets his attention wander. But it wanders by suggestion, and seldom comes back empty. A book is not like an egg. It may be partly good, and partly bad, too bad for blessing, too good for banning, very fit to be skipped, not fit to be ignored. Gaboriau had a habit of spoiling his best stories by superfluous second volumes, when the interest had been exhausted by the first. He who has not read the first volume of *Monsieur Lecoq* has not exhausted life's pleasures. There is no conceivable reason why any human being should read the second. Certainly no idle reader

would do so, for he would lose his right to the name. Authors compete for the idle reader. It is he they really want to capture, unless they are so fortunate as to be the fashion themselves. The idle reader cares nothing about fashion. What is it to him whether he ought to read a book? To read it because other people read it would be in his eyes about as sensible a proceeding as following a lot of sheep through a gate. The idle reader gives an author the best chance. He has no prejudices, no prepossessions. No judge on the bench is more impartial than he because he thinks of nothing but his own amusement. At the same time he has one advantage over many professional critics. He is on the look-out for merits, not for defects. Mistakes do not trouble him, unless they are stupid. He never misses the point of a story, or of a joke. He would be punishing himself if he did. Reviewers sometimes flatter. The idle reader never does, except in the sincerest form, by idly reading. His own mind may profit, especially if it be habitually confined to a groove, profit by the mere fact that he lets it go, giving his fancy play. 'The best in this kind are but shadows, and the worst are no worse, if imagination amend them.' The caustic reply to these magic words, 'It must be your imagination, and not theirs,' would be rather trying to the idle reader. But there are sparks of imagination in unimaginative people which idle reading is apt to fire. According to Browning's Bishop Blougram, 'a chorus-ending from Euripides' may destroy the sceptic's confidence in his position by the number of fancies it suggests. That is just what happens to the idle reader. Euripides is not to him an ingeniously bad playwright, with wonderfully human characters, but a speculative genius, who crowds the brain with thick-coming ideas that can be tested by actual experience. It is not idle to read Euripides. It is much idler not to read him, and Mr. Gilbert Murray has done his best to save us the trouble. No dramatist is more desultory, and yet none had more passages which make the idle reader of to-day feel that he must be ancient, or the ancients must be modern. 'We drift idly upon fables,' says the nurse in the *Hippolytus* at the end of a passage rather too philosophical for her education and calling. Euripides was speaking through her to idle readers of distant ages which he could not even dimly foresee.

HERBERT PAUL.

THE PEARL FISHERY OF CEYLON

THE finding of pearls is probably one of the most interesting industries in the world. It is carried on with every element of romance and by methods which have not materially varied during historic time. It is an industry which can only be prosecuted for a few weeks in the year. The profits are a gamble; while the beautiful products, useless in themselves, are only valuable owing to the pride and vanity of purchasers. For all these reasons some account of the Ceylon pearl fishery may be of interest. The matter has recently been brought to the notice of the British public owing to the fact that the Ceylon Government has lately leased its fishing rights to a private company for a period of twenty years—a transaction which has called forth unfavourable comment in England.

At a time when public opinion is more and more inclined to a certain amount of nationalisation or municipalisation of industry, it is only natural that any action of a Government which is diametrically opposed to this principle should excite criticism, and when a Government actually surrenders a great enterprise and leases it to a private company the public is inclined to judge the matter without weighing the evidence. The transaction itself runs counter to the political faith of many, and these, earnest and vocal, ignorant of detail but eager for a principle, condemned the Colonial Government unheard. Questions were asked in Parliament, and the Press, keen to attack or defend general principles, was for a short time busy over the matter, which then fell back out of the public mind and now lies dormant. I do not desire either to defend or condemn the lease of the Ceylon Government's property to private persons. All I desire to do is to set forth such facts as I have been able to gather on the spot as to the fishery in general, its history and vicissitudes, and leave the reader to decide for himself whether, with the facts before him, he condemns the Government of Ceylon or holds with that Government that the best interests of the Colony have been served by their action.

The known facts in regard to the pearl oyster are so few, its natural history, in spite of constant study, remains so mysterious, that it is almost impossible to arrive at an absolute conclusion, but I will

endeavour to set these facts out and leave the matter for judgment. A short description of the pearl fishery itself and a few personal details of a visit to the banks will, I think, present the matter clearly.

The north-west coast of Ceylon, a low-lying coast of red-brown sand, harbourless, encumbered with sandbanks and shoals at sea, is clothed with a wild and thorny jungle. For the greater part of the year a resounding surf breaks unceasingly, and only between the monsoons is it possible for a ship to approach the shore. For hundreds of square miles the jungle is unbroken by any sign of cultivation. Elephants, leopards, deer, and pig wander undisturbed, and only here and there a few tiny villages near reedy tanks shelter a few poor fishermen and hunters. Far inland lie the vast remains of ancient buried cities once great and populous: to-day the land is desolate, fever-haunted, and solitary. To this wild coast year by year there comes a multitude. Here, year by year, a city more ephemeral than any other in the world rises and disappears, leaving no trace behind. A few boats arrive upon the coast and workmen disembark. Palm leaves are cut and wattled, old wattled leaves are unpiled, stout posts are driven into the ground, and building operations begin. In a few weeks a town of palm-leaf houses has arisen more marvellous in the rapidity of its construction than any one-day city of the West, ordered into broad streets, market places, police courts, official residences, lighted with street lamps, provided with shops, bazaars, and public houses, and ready for the reception of from ten to forty thousand people. Within a few days every house is let at prices which would excite the cupidity of a London landlord. Divers, boatmen, merchants from the whole East, arrive and settle in their quarters. Where the wild pig roamed, a vast multitude of men traffic, bargain and throng the streets, long lines of women wend down the roads to the well, hundreds of boats cover the sea, vast fortunes change hands; and a few weeks later the palm-leaf town melts once more. Where so many thousands have lived, where the police patrolled the ordered streets and the lamps shone on accumulated wealth, the sun pours down upon the empty shore, and the elephant, the deer, and the pig wander again at their will.

Early in the year the oyster banks far out to sea have been carefully surveyed and the fishing limits marked by flags and buoys, and upon a given day the fishery is declared open and work begins. By this time the interval between the two monsoons has come and the sea is calm. At midnight several hundred large boats, each containing some sixty men, set sail and stand out to sea, running before a favourable wind which, with extraordinary regularity, changes and brings them back again during the afternoon. The boats sail out some twelve or fifteen miles, and on reaching the bank which is to be fished lie within the buoyed limits and the fishing begins. The divers descend with a heavy weight which brings them quickly to the sea floor, collect as

many oysters as possible, and on giving a signal are rapidly pulled to the surface again with their catch. There they remain for a few minutes alongside the boat, their heads rising and falling in the swell, and then, one after another, sink down into the sea and again return with their basket; a short time to get their breath, and then down again, and so on without ceasing for six hours. The only appliance used to assist them is a tortoise-shell clip upon the nostrils to prevent the entrance of water, and even this is not universally used. The time which the men can remain under water has, I think, been exaggerated. The average dive occupies about thirty-five to fifty seconds, the Arabs, who are the best divers, remain under from seventy to eighty-five seconds, while the maximum is not above ninety seconds. When it is remembered that the whole of this period is one of violent exertion it is possible to realise how great a strain is put upon the diver. At about noon the fishing for the day is closed, and the boats set sail for the shore, racing one another in their desire to unload the first oysters of the day.

As soon as the oysters are landed they are taken into a large stockade, where the sacks are checked and counted, one-third of the catch being handed back to the divers as payment for their work. These are immediately sold in the street, and promptly opened and searched by eager workers. About half a million oysters are brought in in a day, the record catch being, I believe, 5,000,000. When the extent of the catch has been ascertained, the buyers assemble and the sale begins. The auctioneer announces the name of the bank, the number to be sold, and the value of the pearls taken from a sample lot of oysters from the same locality.

In an open space there stands a small building, the roof of palm leaves, the sides open to admit the air. The night is still and hot. Far down on the beach and in the town the hoarse clamour of thousands of voices fills the air like the distant murmur of a racecourse crowd, but in and around the little hall men stand silent and expectant. They are of all races, Bombay pearl merchants, Kilakarai moormen, Paumben chetties, all nationalities, all creeds, all the costumes of the East. The high cap of the Mahomedan, long robes of red and white, plump men almost naked, young and old, backed many of them by vast sums to their credit and all eager for the gamble of the evening. The price bid per thousand oysters slowly rises; it is not only a sale, it is a lottery. A man may buy fifty thousand at ninety rupees a thousand, and find that he incurs a heavy loss; another from a modest thousand may obtain a start in life. Every shell is a lottery ticket of an unknown value. At last the hammer falls and the first lot is sold. So the sale goes on. The bids are repeated in two languages, so that all may understand, and in half an hour half a million oysters have been sold. At first sight it seems extraordinary that the owners

of the fishery should not find it worth their while to find the pearls themselves. But it is probable that a greater average profit is derived from the sale of the oysters. This sale attracts merchants to the spot who are throughout India the middlemen and distributors in the pearl trade, so that without them it would be difficult to dispose of the enormous quantities found. The searching of from forty to eighty million oysters would involve a gigantic staff, so that it would be almost impossible to prevent theft; and it is always difficult and sometimes dangerous to disturb an immemorial custom in the East. The pay of the divers also hangs upon the sale, as they are able to get a good price for their share of the oysters from merchants who buy them as samples of the day's catch, opening them on the spot and deciding what price they are prepared to pay at the auction. It is quite possible, too, that on many days the prices obtained from sale are higher than the actual value of the pearls contained in the oysters sold. A gambling fever runs through the whole community. Any full-grown oyster may contain a pearl worth two hundred pounds. On an average, from a good bank, one oyster in every ten contains a pearl of some sort—possibly very small indeed, like a grain of sand; one-tenth of these pearls will probably be round, smooth, and of a good colour, but in any case every pearl commands a price, and a few good ones give a profit. As the fishery goes on, every man in the camp is more and more drawn into the fascination of this gigantic lottery. Small urchins collect their cents and buy one oyster; one boy finds a valuable pearl, and immediately every child in the town is saving and buying and opening. Here and there throughout the neighbourhood men squat down beside a pile of shells, open their oysters with a knife, and with anxious fingers grope among the flesh. The same spirit which fires these small purchasers falls upon the great dealers, and as the bids go up you will see men's faces working with excitement. The East is said to be stoical, but I have never seen such emotion among Monte Carlo gamblers.

That pearls of great value are often found is certain. But they are seldom seen. The lucky finder has no desire to send up the price of the next auction by his boasting, and hides his treasure away in the hope of finding a match, in which case the value of the pair is greatly enhanced. Thus it is impossible to say what is the total value of the pearls found, or how large a proportion of the world's supply comes from the Ceylon fishery.

The last state of the oysters, that in which they deliver up their secrets, is more disagreeable than it is possible to describe. They remain in great heaps guarded by strong stockades for several days under the burning rays of the sun. For some hours they survive, but in a short time the rotting begins. Myriads of flies buzz around them, depositing their eggs in the putrefying mass. A faint sickly odour

arises, which in a few days has become an absolutely overpowering stench, so evil that it sickens a man at a breath. When many millions are rotting the whole neighbourhood seems corrupted. For five miles out at sea the smell is overpowering, and when, in the evening, the wind changes the town and the jungle for miles inland is invaded by this ghastly scent of corruption. As the fishery progresses the place becomes black with flies, which, breeding in the oysters, invade every house and, added to the smell, make life hideous. When the oysters are sufficiently rotten they are washed for pearls.

Having fallen under the universal mania of the place, I had myself bought a few thousand oysters and was therefore obliged to superintend the washing. When several days had passed and the lot were what is euphemistically called 'matured,' I had the sacks taken to a spot some distance away from all habitations. A large tub was procured and partly filled with water, and the putrefying contents of one sack was emptied in. It is quite impossible to describe the appalling smell which immediately arose, a smell quite overwhelming and next to impossible to endure. In a moment the surface of the water was covered with thousands of maggots struggling wildly to escape out of the tub. These were drained off and fresh water poured in, while the shells were picked out from beneath the water, tapped together to shake out any pearl which might chance to adhere to them, and thrown away. The putrid flesh now remained under the water, and this was kneaded by the men, who must not, without permission, take their hands out of the tub during the operation. Every few minutes a man, churning the filthy mixture, would come upon a pearl and hand it over. This continued until the whole mass of material had been broken up, when it was removed in cloths and left in the sun to dry. Even when dry the smell was horrible, and among these dry but unpleasant remains it was necessary to search for the smaller pearls which had escaped notice during the washing. The quantity discovered was quite extraordinary, and though the majority of these were small or mis-shapen, a few good pearls appeared. I do not think that after a few days at the fishery it is possible ever to regard these beautiful jewels with the same admiration as before. One remembers when one sees their wonderful refinement and beauty the ghastly corruption in which they are discovered. One remembers that they are but a disease, a kind of tumour, epidemic in certain places; and, though the pearl itself shines bright and clear among the filth in which one sees it first, one does not forget how many days must pass before the smell of putrid flesh finally leaves it clean and pure and ready to be worn.

The fishery commences about the 20th of February. Five or six weeks later the monsoon usually breaks. The sea becomes too rough for the divers, and operations cease. The men return to their

homes in the Persian Gulf or on the Indian coast. The merchants depart. The town is pulled down, and only a pile of oyster shells on the beach tells of the year's business.

Such, then, is the pearl fishery, a valuable property of the Ceylon Government, which for a period of twenty years has passed into private hands, a transaction which has agitated public opinion.

When a Government or a Corporation takes into its own hands an enterprise hitherto privately managed, it is often very difficult to prophesy the result. When, on the other hand, a public body leases its business, one does not expect to find great difficulty in discovering whether or no a good bargain has been made. The case of the Ceylon pearl fishery, however, presents so many obscure points, and is of so complicated a nature, that only after considerable study is it possible to arrive at a just conclusion. The attention of the public has been directed to certain facts which, taken alone, would form a strong indictment against the Colony, and upon this partial view of the case judgment has been asked for. Briefly, the facts in question are these: that Ceylon has accepted 310,000 rupees per annum for twenty years for a property which yielded in round figures 800,000 rupees in 1903, a million rupees in 1904, and nearly two and a-half million rupees in 1905. Judged by these figures alone, the action of the Government of Ceylon has naturally been severely criticised, the late Secretary of State for the Colonies has come in for his share of abuse, and it has been shown to the satisfaction of many writers in the Press that an almost unprecedented act of folly has been committed.

It is time that the true facts were set forth. The Ceylon Pearl Fishery has flourished from time immemorial. Five hundred years before our era commenced the Aryan conquerors of the country record the sending of rich gifts of pearls to India. For two thousand years the fishery has been celebrated from China to the Mediterranean. Travellers of all nations—Greeks, Egyptians, Barbary Moors, Arabs, Venetians, and Genoese—all speak of this rich harvest of the sea. When Ceylon fell to the Portuguese, that enterprising people did not miss so valuable a prize. The Dutch, who supplanted them, have left official records of their fisheries; while since the English occupation every fact which bore upon the matter has been carefully noted. A search amongst these records reveals the fact that from time to time, for reasons hitherto mysterious, there have occurred, without warning, absolute failures in the fishery over long periods of years. For years together the most diligent search upon the banks has shown them to be absolutely barren; a few years later and the sea floor is littered with myriads of oysters, which, remaining for an uncertain time, again mysteriously disappear. When the Dutch took over the banks in 1658 the inhabitants of that part of the island had fallen

into a state of utter destitution, owing to the prolonged failure in the oyster crop. The first Dutch fishery was held in 1663, the second in 1669, and the third not till twenty-two years later in 1691. In 1700 the fishery failed entirely, and so often did this occur that it has been computed that between 1666 and 1904, a period of 238 years, only fifty-eight fisheries were held. The history of the banks since 1838 is recorded with exactness. Out of the sixty-five years from that date up to 1904 the first sixteen years were barren, and in twenty-nine of the remaining forty-nine years no fishery could be held. The net revenue derived by Ceylon during the whole of this period was 657,000*l.*, or an average annual sum of about 10,000*l.*, equal to 150,000 rupees. The year 1905, the last year during which the banks remained in the hands of the Government, produced an unprecedented fishery. Seventy-eight and a half million oysters were brought to shore, the representatives of the lessees protested that the banks had been fished absolutely bare, and a great windfall was placed in the hands of the Government. By the terms of the lease the Government is now entitled to a rent, for twenty years, of 310,000 rupees a year, and is to be saved an expenditure upon the camp in payment of police and other services which in 1905 amounted to 220,000 rupees. The rent is therefore more than double the average revenue, and, if the camp expenditure is included, the amount gained and saved by the Colony is about two and a half times the average annual value of the fishery for the past sixty-five years. In addition to this, the lessees are to spend from one to three million rupees, as the Government may direct, in the improvement of the fishery, and are restricted as regards the number of oysters fished during the last few years of the lease. These are the facts of the case, and I think that upon these facts only one conclusion is possible—namely, that the Government of Ceylon have driven a bargain which should silence criticism.

It will immediately be said that the group of astute financiers who have leased this fishery would not have moved in the matter had there been no prospect of a dividend: nor is this objection unreasonable. The question to be solved is one of natural history. If the cause of the periodic disappearance of the oysters can be discovered and measures taken to prevent this disappearance, then the future of the pearl fishery is secured. The matter has been for some time under examination at the hands of marine biologists, who may be trusted to find a solution of the mystery if it is discoverable. A most careful survey of the banks is now annually made, and the beds which are to be fished each year are systematically examined and the oysters roughly counted. Boats moving in circles round given points send down divers, whose take is carefully recorded on a chart, with the average age of the oysters. As it is known that a good

diver can clear from two and a half to three square yards at a dive, the number of million oysters upon a bank can be approximately arrived at. Nor is this computation found from the fishing results to be inaccurate. Various causes lead to the disappearance of the oysters from banks upon which they have been seen and counted. It is believed by some that they occasionally detach themselves from their hold and move away, but, though this may be the case when young, it is doubtful if they do so when mature. The shifting of the sand owing to the storms and currents probably accounts for their disappearance in many cases where they are gradually silted over, lie buried beneath the sea floor, and so perish. Boring sponges which pierce the shell are responsible for much disease and many deaths; while the oyster is as susceptible as all other creatures to the evil effects of overcrowding, which lowers their vitality, arrests the shell growth, and causes widespread mortality. The young spat is washed away into unfavourable places and so lost, while the old oyster is liable to the attacks of its greatest enemy, the huge ray, which with its teeth of great crushing power is able to crunch the strongest shells. Shoals of these fish, many of them five feet across, pass along the banks annihilating the oysters, and destroy whole beds within a short time. These are probably the chief causes of the uncertainty which has always hung over the banks from year to year. And if these are responsible for the frequent failure of the fishery, it is possible that this failure may be prevented by depositing large quantities of broken stone upon the bottom. These stones prevent to some extent the drifting of the sand, they afford a holding ground for the oysters, and ward off the attacks of the ray, who, unable to differentiate between the oysters and the stones, become discouraged and move off. Experiments have already been tried in the transportation of young oysters about nine months old from unfavourable ground. Ten millions were dredged from a small area, and so great was the number found that after these had been gathered there was no apparent diminution in the numbers brought up, and so far the divers report that they have suffered no mortality. An oyster of from three and a half to four and a half years old may yield fine pearls, so that if these experiments succeed in maintaining a constant supply a fine return may be expected before many years.

It is of course possible that investigation may at any time throw light upon the pearl-forming parasite. The host of the adult parasite is not known, but as oysters from neighbouring areas vary enormously in pearl infection it is supposed that certain conditions attract this host, whatever it may be. The pearl production of one generation of oysters is little indication of the yield of the following generation upon the same beds—a fact which increases the mystery. Should the history of this parasite be discovered it will probably be possible to

increase the infection at will. The question is being most carefully investigated, and a solution is not beyond the bounds of possibility.

If, as is probable, even without the aid of this discovery, the highly scientific management of the banks largely increases the number of fisheries per decade, then the lessees will have obtained a magnificent reward, and when the lease is over the Colony will take possession of a fishing-ground which will have become one of the finest properties owned by any Colonial Government in the Empire.

SOMERS SOMERSET.

AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS

I HAVE been an author for forty-six years. I have brought out, alone or in co-operation, more than sixty books, and I have had dealings with ten publishing-houses. I have no hesitation in saying that these dealings have been satisfactory to me, quite as satisfactory, for I will make no comparisons, as have been my relations with the doctors and solicitors whom I have come across in the course of a long life. I consider myself to have been treated with justice and even generosity. I allow that I have had, or at least have supposed myself to have, causes of complaint. But these causes have been very few, and it is quite possible that I may have failed to take the other side of the case into due consideration. As I wish to tell the whole truth, I will state, without of course giving any names, my grievances. There are but two of them. I arranged for the publication by a certain firm of two books on the half-profit system. One of the stipulations of the agreement, usual and indeed I can readily believe necessary, was that the publisher should have the right of disposing of the books at such a price as should seem good to him. The theory on which this stipulation is founded is that the publisher is equally interested with the author in making the sales as profitable as possible. But in practice this sometimes works badly. It did so with me. My books are of a kind which sell slowly, being used for prizes and gifts, and they are published at low prices. I can easily imagine that a firm accustomed to dealings on a large scale would find it not worth their while to burden themselves with a business of this kind. What they did was to sell the stock in hand at something like a 'remainder' price. I got my share at once, but it was much less than a half of what I should have received in the ordinary course. The other grievance is that an inadequate offer was made to me which I was improvident and ignorant enough to accept. No compulsion was put upon me. It is only fair to allow that the publisher did not suppose that the book would earn the profit which, as a matter of fact, it did earn. And the whole question of 'bargains' is one of great moral difficulty. You see a picture, or a *curio*, or an old book or manuscript for sale. The possessor does not know its value and you do. Is it right to buy it

at the inadequate price at which, in ignorance of its real value, it is offered? One friend to whom I told the story thought that I had no right to complain. 'It was your own doing,' he said, with perfect truth. Other friends have sympathised with me. But if this is the worst that an author of very large experience can say of his treatment by publishers, his testimony is, on the whole, highly favourable to them. On the other hand, I have received various kindnesses. I have had payments made to me in excess of the sums stipulated. I have received the full advantage under agreements which admitted of modification. The price set by me on a book has been voluntarily increased, *before publication*, by the firm to which I offered it. I feel bound to state emphatically my conviction that the charges of rapacity and hard dealing so freely brought against publishers are unjust. No one who knows the name which is subscribed to this article will suppose that I am one of the authors who can practically make their own terms, who are safe from any imposition or sharp practice because it would be in the highest degree impolitic to offend them. I am not an important client; my place could easily be filled up. I am typical of a large class of authors, the men and women whose moderate literary abilities have been directed, whether by good fortune or by good judgment, to subjects which suited them, and who have received a moderate reward. Let me give a few facts. My sixty odd books have had, as far as I can calculate, an aggregate sale of something more than three-quarters of a million. This is an imposing figure, but when it is divided by, say, sixty, it does not mean much, especially when it is remembered that some of these books are small school-books of which many thousands must be sold before any profit is obtained. (I see one of which eight thousand have been sold at a profit to me of 10*l.* 10*s.*) My most profitable book was one of the earliest. It appeared about thirty years ago, and up to the present time it has brought me in 817*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* This has been a moderately profitable venture both to the publishers and myself, but the figures amply prove my statement that I am not one of the exceptional authors who can command exceptional treatment. On the other hand, as I review my list of receipts, I am aware of ventures which were not successes. One or two titles do not appear in the list for the simple reason that I have received nothing from them—*i.e.* because they have been an entire failure. But, then, I have lost nothing by them, except my time; the publisher has lost money. Others show a balance of profit as far as I am concerned, but must have been losing speculations to the publisher. As long as the balance is against the book, the publisher loses the interest on his expenditure. I have before me, as I write, the accounts of a volume which after twenty years showed an adverse balance of 30*l.* This means, when interest is taken into account, a loss to the publisher of at least double that

sum. Another volume published thirty odd years ago now brings in a small return, but the balance was on the wrong side for more than half the time. It has brought me in 50*l.* I imagine that the publisher has made nothing by it.

As to the profits of publishers, I have no particular claim to speak. I once held, it is true, as a trustee, some shares in a publishing company, still flourishing I am glad to say, and found that they made a very modest return, and I once acted as umpire or arbitrator in the valuation of copyrights, and found that the publishers did not receive an excessive share of the profits of a book. (It may be mentioned, as indicating the very precarious nature of these profits, that the highest professional valuation of a copyright does not exceed five years' purchase. A firm, to put this fact into figures, which may be making 5,000*l.* per annum by copyrights in its possession, would not be able to sell them for more than 20,000*l.*) On the whole, it may be safely affirmed that publishing is not by any means a royal road to wealth. The failure or the embarrassment of publishing houses, not unfrequently of good standing and repute, is not uncommon. A few houses have the reputation of being wealthy, but I imagine they are not more wealthy than are the manufacturers of paper and of ink. We can see, on the other hand, that the expenses are heavy. A clerical establishment has to be kept up; a special arrangement has to be made for valuing the manuscripts which are submitted for acceptance. To say that this last expenditure is absolutely unremunerative is, perhaps, an exaggeration. Sometimes a treasure is discovered, though, unlike other *treasure trove*, it will have to be paid for at its full value. But by far the greatest part of this labour is absolutely wasted. It is a moderate estimate that for one manuscript accepted *nine* are rejected. The fees paid to the reader for his labour are totally lost, though they certainly are an insurance against losses of a more serious kind.

This brings me to the subject of the prices commonly charged for books. Publishers are frequently accused not only of unfair dealing with authors, but of greed in respect of the public, from whom they are said to exact extravagant prices for the books which they bring out. But the indictment also contains a count of incapacity. If they knew their own interests, it is said, they would sell at much lower prices, and would find a much larger circle of purchasers. Certain allegations made in support of these accusations may be at once disposed of. 'We can buy English books in the Colonies,' it is said, 'at half the prices which we are compelled to pay in England.' That is quite possible; but it does not prove what it is meant to prove. To put the matter briefly and in a concrete form, it is because the book is sold, say, for five shillings in England, that it can be sold for half-a-crown in Australia or Canada. An edition of a thousand is brought out in this country, is sold at five shillings, and brings in a

moderate profit to publisher and author. But when the thousand are being printed in this country, it costs little—only the price of the paper and the slight charge for striking off—to print another hundred or two for export. The publisher makes a little out of it, the author may also make a little. Personally, I am not aware of ever having received a sixpence from either Australia or Canada. Books *published* in the Colonies are as highly priced, as far as my observation goes, as books published here. I will give another case. Nothing is more familiar than the sixpenny edition of some popular work, novel or other. These editions, of course, are possible only because the book has had a remunerative sale at a higher price, and so it becomes worth while to appeal to another public. It might appear unnecessary to state things that would seem to be obvious, and yet many people do not know them. A few months ago I received a letter which showed that the writer was wholly ignorant of the conditions under which books are produced and sold. She was a lady, possessed, it was clear, of some literary knowledge, for she made a suggestion of a subject about which I might, she thought, write. I forget what the subject was; it did not seem to me eligible. It was, indeed, somewhat out of the way. This made it unsuitable for me, but showed that the lady's reading was well extended. She said in effect, 'If you should write this book, I should be glad to purchase a copy; it would, I suppose, be published at the price of ——,' and she mentioned a book which had been published in a cheap form with a binding of which she was pleased to approve. I pointed out to her in my reply that for the particular edition which she mentioned I was being remunerated at the rate of 5*l.* per thousand, and that if I wrote a new book on the subject suggested by her, and sold two thousand copies, a greater number, indeed, than I could expect, my remuneration would be 10*l.*; and this for a book of not less than eighty thousand words.

Most of the talk about the price at which books can be sold and ought to be sold, for 'ought' is a very different matter from 'can,' seems to me very ill-informed. The first person to suffer, if books are to be materially cheapened, must be the author. Where there is no author to be considered, prices are lowered to a point at which it would be unreasonable to complain. The 'Temple Classics,' 'Everyman's Library,' the 'New Universal Library,' to mention names which occur to me at the moment, are marvels of cheapness. It is the author who complicates the question with his troublesome necessity of living, a necessity which most of the controversialists in this matter appear not to acknowledge. We suffer, as it is, from the competition of the great writers who have passed beyond the necessity of earning their bread. We are beginning to realise the quaint fancy of De Quincey—it is his, if my memory serves me—that some day the 'majority,' the uncounted generations of the dead,

would invade the earth and overwhelm the living. Of this we cannot complain; but if we are to be put on the same level with those who do not need food or drink or clothing, our lot will indeed be hard. Looking back to what I have myself received, I feel sure that if the prices of my books had been halved, the few thousands of pounds which have fallen to my lot would have been reduced, at the very best, to half, even to as little as so many hundreds. A book is published at five shillings. This is reduced by discounts and allowances to, say, three shillings and twopence. Out of this I receive—I make sure of being exact by giving my own experience—sevenpence farthing. (The royalty is less than it would be in many cases because the books have illustrations, which increase the cost of production while they increase the sale.) Out of this balance the publisher has to pay the proportionate share of many expenses—the rent, rates, and insurance of a London warehouse, the salaries of a staff of clerks, the expenses of distribution, the cost of printing, paper, and binding, the heavy charge of advertising (and if advertising is to be effectual it must be done with something that looks like prodigality), and his own living profit. I have seen calculations in which none of these items are debited to the book, the cost of manufacture and the discounts to the trade alone excepted. The gentlemen who make these calculations seem to think that the publisher sells his book from a stall or barrow in the streets. Again, it must not be supposed, for one has to guard against the most impossible suppositions, that because a certain profit accrues from the sale of fifteen hundred books at five shillings (nominal), the same would be realised by the sale of three thousand at half the price. I am not prepared to say what sale would bring about the same result. If I must make a guess I should say five thousand. And sales of as many thousands as this are rare—rare, that is, in comparison with the total number of books published, far too rare to be safely calculated upon when considerations of expenditure and receipts are being weighed.

The subject of the selling of books is one of which very few people have any knowledge. They may see, though probably they do not care to read, the list of 'Publications of the Week,' which some journals are accustomed to give. They may notice the annual returns to be found, I think, in the *Publishers' Circular*, of books that have appeared during the year, with its divisions of 'Theology and Philosophy,' 'History and Biography,' 'Science,' 'Fiction,' etc. Still, they have no idea of the books that are actually published. Circumstances have given me a very large experience in this direction, an experience going back nearly forty years, and extending over a very wide range. The number of books which have thus come within my ken is very great, to be counted by scores of thousands. Many, new editions, for instance, and reprints, have been simply enumerated; others have been very briefly described; critical notices have varied

from the statement of very general impressions to the most careful estimate which it was within my power to give. But so far as my present purpose is concerned, the merit or demerit, the adequacy or inadequacy, of my criticisms is not pertinent. I am regarding books in their commercial aspect, as articles which are offered for sale, with a special reference to the question—Would it be practicable, with due regard to the interests of those whose business it is to produce them, to bring about a reduction in price, a reduction widely extended and serious in amount? I will begin by frankly stating my conviction that no such reduction is possible.

We may commence by putting aside a number of books of which the sale is practically *nil*. No one sees them except the publisher, who is probably satisfied with the barest glance, as long as he knows that the author is a solvent person, the compositor, the reader for the press—if the publisher aforesaid should chance to employ such a person—and the reviewer. It does not matter what the prices of such volumes may be; no one ever thinks of buying them. Then there is the class of poetry. And of this, too, I think it may be said that no one thinks of buying it. Much of it is, it is true, absolutely valueless, but much has considerable literary merit. It is really heartrending, if a critic can be credited with the possession of a heart, to see what excellent work is almost certainly doomed to neglect. I remember being so much impressed by the beauty of a volume of verse that I had to notice, that I asked and obtained permission to make it the subject of a special review. A few months afterwards I asked the publisher how many copies had been sold. '*Seven*,' he replied. The book was anonymous, and so the usual small demand that comes from kinsfolk, friends, and neighbours was lost. Here, again, there can be no question of lowering the prices. The author gets, as it is, only a few pounds to set off against the inevitable loss; it would be a pity to make these few fewer still. After poetry may be put fiction. The output of this is enormously large. In a single list of 'Publications of the Week,' there will be sometimes more than twenty, there are seldom less than ten, novels; and the supply, though more abundant at some seasons of the year, never wholly ceases. Many of these are speculations, not of publishers, but of authors. They are bids for fame. A few, probably a very few, have merit; some are absolutely noxious, appealing to tastes which are not literary. If these last could be kept out of the market by halving the customary price, the world would gain rather than lose. But I doubt whether this can be hoped for. The extra cost would in such cases not be counted. Then there is a class which can command a moderate sale, the *maximum* limit being, perhaps, a thousand. Few people buy them, but the circulating libraries take a certain number, and both author and publisher realise a moderate, often a very moderate, profit. I do not believe that the number of

private purchasers would be materially increased by lowering the price. Nine out of ten readers of novels never think of buying the book. They would not give the four shillings and sixpence commonly asked, and they would agree with Mr. Pecksniff in thinking that the sum of eighteen pence was 'equally objectionable.' It is in first-class novels that I see the only probable case in which a lowering of price might increase the total profit. But only the 'first bracket' in the class would be affected. There might be as many as three or four such volumes in an exceptionally good year. One class of fiction, commonly called 'gift books,' must be distinguished. Here there is really a large class of purchasers. Some cynic has remarked that Englishmen never buy books except to give them away. It is certainly true that multitudes of people buy volumes of this kind and never think of buying any others. They have an ample store from which to choose, and they are supplied, as it is, at a very low price. Here, again, I fail to see any reason for expecting any large increase of sales. People buy these books now, and probably would not buy many more if the prices were lowered. In their inmost hearts they think the money wasted, but do not much care whether it is five shillings or half-a-crown that they waste in this fashion. A book is anyhow cheaper than any other present.

Then there are the numerous books which are addressed to a special public. There are local histories; a parson writes about his parish; a town clerk about his town; the son of a long-descended house about his family; a nobleman or squire about his seat; if these publications pay their expenses, it is as much as they do. No lowering of prices would increase the sale, simply because there are no other purchasers to be attracted by the concession. Medical books, treatises on technical subjects of all kinds, are in the same case. The readers who want them, who know that they will be helped by them in their work, buy them irrespective of price—that is, within certain limits. A high price will possibly send away a few, a low price will attract a few, but on the whole price is not considered. This accounts for a very large proportion of the total output of books.

Theological books are an important division of the year's publications. These, too, are addressed to a special public; numerous, indeed, but so much divided in its predilections that it does not furnish many purchasers for any one volume. Many, I might perhaps say most, of these books are published at a loss. Even popular preachers are apt to find themselves less sought after when they are in print than when they are in the pulpit. A friend who had been asked to publish a volume of his sermons, told me that a lady of his congregation had said to him, 'Oh! Mr. G., I am so glad to have had the privilege of reading your book. At last I have been able to borrow it.' She was perfectly well able to spend the five shillings at which the book was priced. It never had occurred to her to buy it.

There are few Englishmen, and still fewer Englishwomen, to whom the idea does occur. There are thousands of well-to-do and even wealthy families whose expenditure on books is nothing or next to nothing. Not one in a thousand spends as much, or even half as much, on them as it does on its wine cellar.

I will conclude by giving what seem to me very significant instances of special books. Nine years ago Messrs. Macmillan published a monumental work by Dr. J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*, translated with a commentary. It was in six volumes, containing in all 3,129 pages and 231 illustrations, plates, and maps. The price was six guineas net, a price that probably seems monstrously high to the advocates of financial reform in books. At the end of the sixth volume is a list of subscribers, a significant document, but not encouraging to those who have the cause of learning at heart. It is worth while to analyse it. Public libraries and colleges took fifty-eight copies; private purchasers, among whom there was one titled person, as many; and booksellers 155. What would have been the effect of halving the price? Possibly a few more libraries and private persons would have purchased the work, but it is as certain as anything not capable of demonstration can be that the increase of numbers would not have made up for the decrease of price. The booksellers would scarcely have increased, and would quite possibly have diminished their orders. The lower price would have meant a much smaller profit. The fact is that in works of this kind the patron is still wanted. There the patron was Trinity College, Cambridge, a wealthy body, as wealth is reckoned in the realm of learning, which thrice renewed Dr. Frazer's fellowship in order to set him free for his work. In his acknowledgments of his Preface, Dr. Frazer puts next to his College his publishers, whom he thanks for their readiness in undertaking and their 'unflinching determination' in carrying out the work. I wonder whether any one of the fifteen thousand whom Mr. Henniker Heaton rallied round the banner of cheap books stirred a finger to help. It is certainly a good thing for literature in general that the public has taken the place of the patron; but it is not the less true that for some at least of the books that really count, that will be remembered and used long after the ephemeral multitude is forgotten, the public is not to be relied upon. If it be urged that *Pausanias* with his store of information about Greek art and religion appeals to a few only, what about the *Dictionary of National Biography*? That should have appealed to every Englishman, but we should not have had it except for the enterprise and generosity of a publisher, Mr. George Smith, and he, I believe, did not make this gift to his country, for such it really was, out of the profits of his business. In the presence of such facts these clamorous complaints seem to be as ungracious as they are ignorant.

ALFRED J. CHURCH.

PAN-ISLAMISM

THE European Powers, in their colonial enterprises and 'spheres of influence,' would seem to have created for themselves a situation singularly abnormal and unstable in equilibrium if, as is the case, the slightest manifestation of vitality on their frontiers, extending over thousands of miles of territory, at once arrests their attention and produces alarm; any tendency towards progress beyond those frontiers becomes a sign of danger to them; any revival, however small, among the inhabitants is at once construed into a menace directed against their authority and their prestige. Not so long ago Europe considered herself menaced by the 'Yellow Peril.' And what was the nature of this 'peril'? Was it that the yellow races had manifested a desire to invade Europe? Certainly not. The 'peril,' which was so much noised about at the time, did not menace the tranquillity of Europe, but it did jeopardise the hope of the colonising Powers bringing under their perpetual yoke this yellow race, whose supposed ethnical inferiority, from the European point of view, was not worthy of a better fate. The unexpected revival of the Far East, however, which apparently the European Powers would have preferred to remain perpetually backward, caused them uneasiness. To encompass its subjugation, therefore, they planned the dismemberment of the Chinese Empire and the enforced submission of Japan; and with this object in view they undertook various military expeditions, posthumous manifestations, after a fashion, of the piracies of by-gone ages. Happily for the good of humanity their efforts proved abortive; and finally the brilliant victories of the Japanese over the Muscovites, who represented the superiority of the European races, till then uncontested, and the serious anti-foreign activities of re-awakened China, gave the finishing stroke to the colonial aspirations of Europe in that quarter of the globe.

If a large slice of the exploitable world thus escaped their domination, the European Powers consoled themselves with the idea that the whole Islamic family of estates still remained to satisfy their rapacity and vanity. But ever since these 'yellow devils' gave to the world a demonstration of the most efficacious method of getting rid of the yoke of Europe, they find that even in these, her 'private preserves,'

her political supremacy, hitherto considered unshakable, is losing ground. She is getting uneasy about the new spirit of independence which is manifesting itself in the Islamic world, so much so that she has now substituted a 'Mussulman Peril' for the 'Yellow Peril' and has called it by a name coined for the occasion, that of 'Pan-Islamism.'

Now, the 'Mussulman Peril' is a danger that Europe need not dread any more than the 'Yellow Peril,' because it is equally free from an aggressive spirit, and is in reality nothing more or less than the awakening of the Mussulman consciousness, tired at last of Western tutelage, which hinders more and more the development of Mussulman society. If Europe is more alarmed at this movement, it is because the new 'peril' is a menace not only to her future projects, as was the case with the 'Yellow Peril,' but also to her already long-established colonial exploitations. Therefore, taking advantage of the geographical position of Mussulman countries which lie on her frontiers and surround her own possessions, she magnifies the peril and distorts its true significance by proclaiming that Pan-Islamism threatens the very existence of modern civilisation—all that heritage of the accumulated labours of centuries, which constitutes at once the glory and the blessing of the human race; that it incites the ignorant masses and barbarians to the worst excesses and to most unjustifiable violence; in short, that in the midst of the twentieth century it reproduces in all their horror the barbarities which the Christians practised in the Middle Ages. Briefly, in our days, it is of no consequence to Europe to rescue the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem from the 'infidels,' because it could not be in better hands, but rather to defend human civilisation against Mussulman fanaticism and barbarity.

It has been known for a long time how untrue as a rule is the European estimation of things Oriental; but never before had this estimation proved itself so tainted with partiality, so contrary to reality, and so little justified even by the most misleading appearances. Consequently, the number is large of those Mussulmans who are asking themselves if it is not a monstrous calumny invented by the Powers most directly interested in the Islamic countries as a justification for designs of excessive repression with a view to stem the tide of Moslem revival and to maintain the Mussulman world in its present state of bondage.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance in the interests both of truth and of general harmony to define in the clearest and most sincerely honest manner the true character of Pan-Islamism, its aim, the circumstances which gave it birth, and its possible consequences, in order to avoid, while yet there is time, those misunderstandings which cannot but still further envenom the present unsatisfactory relations between the East and the West. This is, indeed, an eminently humanitarian work in which everyone should co-operate to the best

of his abilities. It is, however, a task especially incumbent on enlightened Mussulmans, because it is their cause that is under discussion, it is their legitimate aspirations that are in danger of being represented in a distorted shape by certain interested politicians and certain specialists on Oriental questions, strangers to our society and our people, who arrogate to themselves an authority which we are unable to admit. We must no longer suffer these illustrious Orientalists with their inexhaustible store of antiquarian scholarship to place in a false light before European public opinion questions of such vital importance, such intense actuality, and such profound interest to the Moslem community. Nor must we allow them to lead that opinion into channels that are intentionally tortuous and dark. To a few honoured names among them we do most willing homage; but the great majority, no doubt, think that in order to become qualified to treat of questions of the utmost importance to Mussulmans, to discuss their most cherished aspirations, or even their religious doctrines, with an easy self-confidence and imperturbability which never fail to astonish us profoundly in spite of the frequency of these cases—that in order to do all this it is only necessary for them to know, more or less imperfectly, some Oriental language or languages, to have travelled from time to time on business or pleasure in Mussulman countries, and to have put a few questions to some local functionary or interpreter versed in their own language. But, at this rate, there would be found many among Orientals who could boast of being consummate 'Occidentalists,' because, after all, their knowledge of the languages and literatures of Europe, of its manners and morals and spirit, of its mode of thought and psychology, is incontestably superior to the knowledge of the Orient possessed by many of the Orientalists and specialists most in vogue. A large number of highly enlightened Orientals have lived in Europe for long years, have finished their education there and kept up social relations with its people, but I don't know of one who has assumed the title of 'Occidentalist.' The reason is simple. They have recognised the fact that these two peoples are separated by such fundamental differences, based on their widely different mentality, that no Oriental can ever become an 'Occidentalist,' any more than an Occidentalist can become an 'Orientalist' in the true sense of the word.

It is to be hoped that these gentlemen will permit, without taking offence, the remark that Pan-Islamism is not, as they pretend, the grouping together of Moslem communities under the flag of some despotism which would urge them on to carnage; nor is it the political union of peoples professing the same religion. It is neither an occult religious sect nor a secret political association; it is merely a free and complete expression of progress in Moslem societies. It is a compact tacitly entered into by the most enlightened classes of the Mussulman nations, with an object which is purely moral and intellectual. It is

that natural affinity which is, of necessity, automatically established between men seeking for the true and the good, and which unites them in a common ideal, that of Progress, and in a common aspiration, that of Liberty. It is one of the natural consequences of that generous influence of Islam which knew how to create among three hundred million men, different in race, language, condition, and even colour, a solidarity at all times of trial, which recognised neither boundary nor frontier. The aim of Pan-Islamism then is to liberate these three hundred millions of human beings from *any yoke whatsoever that would maintain them in a state of ignorance and degradation*, and that would constitute an obstacle to the free development of their moral and intellectual faculties. It is the awakening of the Islamic conscience, struggling against the aggressor, be he Pope or Khalifa.

It is this awakening that in our days is causing streams of human blood to flow in sacred Arabia, the cradle of Islam; it is that which is organising in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, among the Mussulman elements, living forces which are to enter into the struggle against the arbitrary and despotic rule of the Commander of the Faithful; it is that again which obliges the Shah of Persia, a potentate as little Christian as the Sultan of Turkey, to grant to his subjects a constitution suited to their needs.

Obviously these facts bear eloquent testimony against the doctrine that Pan-Islamism is a revival of the fanaticism and hatred of the Mussulman against the Christian, and their mere enumeration should be sufficient to convince those who hold this doctrine of their error. Was it not in the name of these very revindications, these claims to liberty and justice, that Europe, in days gone by, made her revolutions? But she was never accused of fanaticism. On the contrary, it is to this day considered to redound to her glory that she thus performed her most sacred duty. Is it to be considered a crime for Mussulman nations to follow in her footsteps? Are there to be two different standards, different measures? Are demands admittedly so legitimate to be considered sufficient, *because they are made by Mussulmans*, for stigmatising them with fanaticism, for branding them as odious creatures, deserving of the most brutal repression? How long is it since Europe has learnt to characterise as barbarism aspirations such as these and the heroism lavishly bestowed on such sacred causes which alone ensure human happiness and progress, and efface from the heart of man all germs of intolerance and injustice? We must really ask on which side fanaticism is to be found, and whether accusations such as these do not constitute evident proofs of the excessive intolerance of those who formulate them.

But although it is apparent from what has just been said that Pan-Islamism, so far from being a religious fanaticism, is, on the contrary, a summing-up of the same principles of liberty and progress for which Christendom has had to struggle constantly against its own

Church, it is none the less an imperious and therefore religious duty for the followers of Islam; because in the Mussulman world every human activity, whether collective or individual, bears a religious character by reason of its being governed by the Islamic law, which, within the compass of its precepts, comprehends spiritual and temporal questions to an equal degree, and with the same undisputed authority. The arbitrary dualism which divides human activity into spiritual and temporal does not exist in Islam, which, on the contrary, establishes a complete harmony between all the duties of man, without exception, in order to ensure their normal and regular fulfilment. As to the classification of these duties, it is based solely on their degree of importance and efficacy in relation to the aim of Islam, which is the improvement of man. So that there is no distinction of religious and secular duties, no clergy or privileged classes in Islam; but a logical and consequent unity of human conduct, which is the same for everyone, and of which the sum total constitutes its religion.

This is undoubtedly a unique conception of religion which the Prophet revealed to the human mind. None of his predecessors recognised what he seems to have been the first to understand—namely, that all human mentality and all the most intimate beliefs of man are closely bound up with his conduct and his condition of life. Inspired by this fundamental truth, Islam compels each one of its votaries both to educate himself and to live as a free man. This double obligation is an integral part of the Prophet's teaching, so that Pan-Islamism is only following the long-ignored fundamental precepts of the Mohammedan religion. At length the Mussulman conscience has realised the shortcomings of which Mussulman communities have been guilty, and it will certainly not fail to make amends for their mistakes. When Pan-Islamism, in its work of regeneration and progress, will enlighten Mussulman communities on their true Islamic duties, and will teach them on the authority of quotations from the Koran and the *Ahadith* (traditions) that it is as important for a Mussulman to acquire knowledge as to say his prayers in the mosque, as essential for him to live as a free man as to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca—then will they march along the true Islamic path of progress and felicity; then will they fulfil the sublime commandments of their religion with the same ardour and the same genuine conviction which have proved the despair of the most fervent missionaries who have ever tried to convert them, and with that devotion and courage which in their earlier history they showed in defending against sanguinary invasions and attacks what they then considered their true and their only religious precepts.

I take this opportunity of earnestly entreating those whose mission it is to govern millions of Mussulmans to test and verify these statements concerning Islam. They might appear to them imaginary, and might, perhaps, be received with scepticism. The question is,

nevertheless, sufficiently interesting to deserve some sacrifice of their valuable time, because their investigations in these regions might shed a truer and clearer light on the real character of the modern Islamic movement than do the erudite but unprofitable articles which appear every day in the reviews and in similar publications.

It is Oriental tyrants of the last few centuries who, urged by their instincts of domination and extortion, have caused Mussulman communities to turn aside from the true path of their religion. These miserable wretches arrogated to themselves the right and the privilege of guiding the Mussulman conscience, and of interpreting the Mussulman religion in accordance with the dictates of their own personal interests. They took advantage of their privileged position to derogate from the sublime traditions which had originated this admirable Mussulman civilisation of which the whole human race may justly be proud. They ignored those Islamic principles which had given birth to such a number of powerful and prosperous Moslem States. They misled their people on precisely the most essential points of their duties as Mussulmans, those, in fact, to which we have just drawn attention, because they would have rendered impossible the establishment of their tyranny, the consolidation of their despotism. And this infamous work, which consisted solely in perverting the doctrines of Islam, being pursued for generations, succeeded at length in creating a new tradition made up of impostures and erroneous interpretations which completely divorced the Mussulman peoples from the true principles of their religion.

Let us not forget that Christianity played an important part in the decadence of Mussulman nations, and contributed largely towards that decadence. The Christian Scholasticism of the Middle Ages, then at the height of its power, attacked with unprecedented violence everything that seemed contrary to its philosophy. Naturally Islam could not escape its fierce resentment, and it attacked it simultaneously with the sword and with theological controversy. The Crusaders, inflamed by the clergy and followed by them, harassed the East; and, if Islam triumphed over her aggressors, it unfortunately learnt religious hatred from the Crusaders; while the clergy initiated her into the unwholesome artifices and subtleties of their polemics and of their methods of interpretation. Thanks to these endless metaphysical discussions, Islam created a Scholasticism of her own, completely at variance with her genius, and diametrically opposed to her principles. As intolerant and narrow-minded as the Christian Scholasticism from which it had received its inspiration, it could not but be suited to the culpable designs of the tyrants, and they supported it with all their might in order to establish and consolidate their despotism to the detriment of the people and the religion. Thus perverted, Islam became a terribly dangerous weapon; because, as already pointed out, it embraces in its precepts every human activity. On that account it

found these precepts set at naught, and regulated at the sweet will and pleasure of a covetous and slavish sacerdotalism, abjectly subservient to authority. Christian Scholasticism had kept Christian peoples in ignorance and barbarism; its Islamic counterpart brought forth the retrogression of Mussulman peoples, and led them into slavery. Christendom, having at last shaken off its bonds, is marching vigorously in the path of progress; whereas, the Moslem world, more profoundly disturbed, though just beginning to recover from the blow, is slow to grasp again the true principles of its religion on which depends its salvation.

Built in this way on trickery and injustice, the triumph of Oriental despotism could lay no claim to permanency of duration; it was, indeed, ephemeral and deservedly so. The peoples whom this tyranny had demoralised, for the express purpose of governing them according to its own whims and caprices, were unable to sustain the attacks of Western nations regenerated by the recovery of their liberty, of which the consequences soon manifested themselves in a material form by considerably increasing their powers of aggression. Thus Oriental despotism was in its turn placed under foreign yoke, and it dragged with itself into slavery the Oriental peoples. But foreign domination, founded on the same errors and the same injustices, raised on the ruins of corrupt and corrupting potentates, cannot itself aspire to perpetual life. It is doomed, inevitably, to fall to pieces in its own turn by the action of the very causes which entailed the disappearance of the greatest of Mussulman political institutions. It would have been destined to a longer duration if Europe had realised the importance of her *rôle*, and had really helped the regeneration of the Mussulman nations under her sway, instead of checking their evolution and attributing to fanaticism every legitimate aspiration on their part towards progress and liberty.

Having given an exposition of the true character of Pan-Islamism and of its aims, it remains now to enter more fully into the causes which provoked this movement.

The almost identical nature, varying in degree only, of the complaints of different Moslem communities, has served certain intellects, endowed with too much subtlety, as a pretext for upholding the view that these complaints constitute a revival of their fanaticism—which is tantamount to saying that it is sufficient to be a Mussulman in order to be lacking in all nobler sentiments or higher ideals. But this fact of common grounds of complaint is merely the result of the various Mussulman peoples being placed under the more or less direct control of foreign Powers—strangers to their race and civilisation—and of their thus finding themselves situated under almost identical conditions socially and politically, creating wants and needs also identical in their nature. The Mussulman peoples cannot continue indefinitely, any more than other races can, to live as they have

hitherto lived, because they are unable, without compromising their very existence, to escape from the superior obligations imposed on them by the present stage in their evolution, which is incessantly creating for them fresh exigencies and new *desiderata*.

The need for liberty and activity which they feel and they claim is therefore as legitimate and real as that experienced by any other conglomerations of human beings. Is it not really strange then that on such grounds they should be accused of fanaticism, especially when religious hatred is precisely one of the things that their faith reproves in the strongest terms; when, thanks to its sage precepts, the toleration of Mussulman communities has become an indisputable historical fact so thoroughly proved that it is unnecessary to revert to the subject here? It is due entirely to this toleration that there have at all times existed prosperous and flourishing Christian communities under Mussulman governments; whereas, there are no traces left of Islam, even in Spain, beyond the few sumptuous ruins, worthy landmarks of a magnificent civilisation annihilated by Christian barbarism. True, attempts are nowadays made to convince us that the prosperity of Christian communities in Mussulman countries is due to the protection accorded them by the Western Powers; but the fact is ignored that not more than two hundred years ago no such protection existed, and the Powers were only just able to maintain their own dominions. Moreover, if to-day there is anyone or anything left for them to protect, they owe it entirely to Mussulman toleration; for it is certain that if Mussulman countries, all-powerful at the time, had followed the practices which were then prevalent and which are still prevalent, though in a somewhat attenuated form, in Christian countries, there would not have been a single Christian left in the whole of the Orient to-day.

Moreover, the animosity against the Christian world which is found to exist in the present day is of only recent date, which proves that it has its origin, not in the difference of religious faiths, but rather in the abnormal conditions of existence produced by circumstances. Indeed, it is not so very long ago that the Moslem world, so far from harbouring sentiments of hostility towards the West, was its great admirer. The prestige of her civilisation was so great that the East believed that the light which illuminates the human mind had its source in the West—in a quarter directly opposite to that from which issues the physical light which daily illuminates the material world. Everything in this *renaissance* of human conscience seemed to it admirable. The narrative of these peoples struggling heroically for liberty and justice, working with tenacity for the advancement of science, of which the marvellous discoveries were their just reward, had so fascinated the Eastern mind that its admiration for the West grew into a feeling of veneration, and became almost an article of faith. It was hoped that the preponderating influence which this civilisation

was destined to acquire in the whole world would be a powerful factor in the regeneration of peoples crushed by Oriental tyranny and plunged in the darkest ignorance.

But all these beautiful dreams, these thrilling hopes, ended in bitter disappointment; for at length it was realised from experience, dearly bought, that the fine promises of Europe to civilise the world and to deliver the oppressed from the yoke of tyrants had only served to dissimulate her avarice and establish her arbitrary and demoralising sway. The Oriental conscience discovered a little too late the consequences of its lamentable and unsophisticated credulity.

Europe must blame herself for this sudden and complete change, to her prejudice, of the sentiments of the Moslem world; it is the work of her own hands and the inevitable result of her violent passion for wealth and dominion. To impute this change to the supposed hatred that Mussulmans feel towards Christianity, or towards Christians because they profess a faith different from their own, would be the height of absurdity, and would amount to an absolute denial of undeniable truth.

It is in this desire of rendering impossible the regeneration of the Islamic world, or of retarding it for as long as possible, that Europe has missed the eminently humanitarian and civilising *rôle* which it was her natural destiny to fulfil. Her violent instincts of profit and domination, however, have blinded her, and now there is no quibble, no 'slimness,' no methods however equivocal, that she is above employing in order to exculpate herself and lay at the door of her victims what is her own fault. If Europe had taken the trouble to educate the Mussulman peoples that had come under her direct domination, would not the 'fanaticism' of which she complains have disappeared altogether, or at any rate been greatly attenuated? Conscious of her guilt, Europe will not allow herself to be taken by surprise; she is forearmed; she is quite ready with a defence she prepared years ago. She argues that Mussulman races have always proved themselves refractory towards Western culture, are incapable of understanding its spirit and of adapting themselves to European morality—that in a word they are incapable of being civilised. This thesis could only have possessed any value at all when pseudo-scientific theories of the relative inferiority of all other races to the European were in full vogue. But ever since the events in the Far East have practically discredited these pretty theories, and since their scientific value has nowadays become highly problematical, this European thesis has entirely lost its prestige.

It is always difficult to defend a bad cause, and the argument put forward by Europe fails to justify her conduct. The Oriental who has observed her doings at close quarters, who has suffered from the methods of civilisation especially designed for her colonies, and who is consequently in a position to judge at their true value her

pretended efforts, can detect in this argument the avowal of her culpability.

It cannot be maintained that Europe has ever desired the intellectual and moral elevation of the Mussulman peoples under her sway; it cannot even be admitted that she has ever tried to do so in good faith. On what else indeed does her exploitation of the East, and her peaceful enjoyment of the possessions she has so profitably acquired there, rest, if not on the difference of intellectual level that exists between her and the people she has subjugated, working like beasts of burden for their masters; on the rivalries she has fomented and keeps up between these benighted peoples, incapable of understanding their own true interests and unable to keep clear of the traps laid to entangle them? Is it conceivable then that Europe should have helped them to shake off her own yoke; that she should have been so inconsistent as to try to sap with her own hands the foundations on which are based her prestige and her dominion? The attempts then which she professes to have made could not, in any case, have been sufficiently sincere to deserve a better fate.

As for the spirit she has tried to infuse, with no more success, into the Islamic world, it was that of the most abject and most degrading submission: the spirit which would raise to the dignity of a religious cult the acceptance of her natural supremacy, and would foist off all the caprices of her domination as so many blessings for those who would submit to them. Finally, if even Western morality has not been fated to meet with a better reception among Orientals, it is due to the unedifying pictures of it presented to their view by missionaries and colonial functionaries. Surely, to take the Mussulmans to task for having disdained the moral code of the intruders and preferred their own would be to disregard altogether the true and wholesome principles of ethics. That is why this re-awakening of the Mussulman conscience, which should have marked the dawn of an era of peace and solidarity between the East and the West, manifests itself to-day in the shape of distrust and rancour.

I have now summed up in all sincerity and without any *arrière pensée* the causes which have given birth to Pan-Islamism. This exposition contains substantially the grievances and the sentiments of the Moslem world at the present moment—felt in a manner more or less precise, more or less intense, according to the degree of intellectual development attained by the respective communities concerned. It is possible that in the camps that are hostile to Mussulman aspirations our detractors may wish to contradict all my statements and may employ all the arts of rhetoric to deprive them of all semblance of truth and logic. It is possible that they may find a mare's nest, and for the purpose of combating our thesis may condescend to make use of some small isolated incident, some act committed without reflection and on the spur of the moment in some part of the

Mussulman East. Past-masters in the art of interpreting to their own advantage any facts whatsoever, these pleaders will here find a splendid opportunity of showing off their subtle and resourceful art. But what it will not be in their power to do is to detract from the real and intrinsic value appertaining to Mussulman aspirations, from the fact of their being the aspirations of such a vast mass of humanity. Whatever may happen, this fact alone will impart to them an unquestionable importance, calculated sooner or later seriously to influence the course of events.

It is certain that the consideration and respect these 'revindications' will inspire will depend more on the wise and moderate but persistent activity which Pan-Islamism will display in obtaining them, than on any attempts at persuasion by the most ingenious arguments possible. That is why I have here confined myself to an honest and true exposition of the ideas current in the Moslem world. It is not indeed the fear of discussion that has made me avoid it, but its absolute futility at the present moment, when mental sobriety and impartiality are so conspicuous by their absence that it is hopeless to enter upon a discussion of this nature with any prospect of its being profitable. In fact, the contingency of the emancipation of the East makes uneasy the mind of Europe, and she contemplates with apprehension any transformation of this nature. She dreads a future which may place her present supremacy in question and create for her a new problem full of unknown factors. It is difficult for her to get accustomed to the idea of having sooner or later to abandon her colonial system which has proved so satisfactory in feeding both her purse and her vanity.

It seems to us that these apprehensions have assumed an exaggerated form. The domination of Europe in the East undoubtedly rests on her intellectual superiority and her greater activity, and it is therefore natural that it should continue, while this difference of level between her and the people she has subjugated endures. But there is nothing to prove that it will last for ever, if one takes into account the fact that this superiority is of no earlier date than two centuries ago, and if there is any truth in the maxim that every beginning has an ending. The colonising Powers persist in thinking that their political supremacy and their domination are the indispensable guarantees of their material interests—and that explains the hostile attitude towards Pan-Islamism. But in our times political domination does not exercise the same influence on economic questions as it used to in bygone days; it may even become prejudicial to economic interests, inasmuch as it is a fruitful source of constant friction and trouble, and is engendering a spirit of hostility to all foreign domination. It is the comprehension of this truth that has enabled Germany, without striking a blow, without having recourse to needless coercion, to create for herself everywhere in the Moslem world lucrative openings

and markets which she will in time be able to monopolise. Though not possessing a colonial Empire, the already prodigious development of her productions is constantly increasing, and her successes in world-competition are so many proofs of her far-sightedness and her superior comprehension of the moral and material requirements of the present day. She has grasped the fact that her chances of monopolising Mussulman markets depend on her abstention from meddling with the governments of the peoples with whom she desires to establish commercial relations, and on the care with which she can avoid all moral irritation and resort to force. She has realised that she will succeed in achieving her ends not so much by imposing on them her own law, spirit, and manners, as by efforts at a thorough understanding of the needs of the different peoples, and of the manners and customs peculiar to each, in order to give them satisfaction by adapting herself as far as possible to their special requirements. She has, in short, inaugurated the true system of exchange which ought by right to prevail in the twentieth century, and which secures to her an unprecedented prosperity and a moral supremacy which the Powers with colonial dominions will no longer be able to preserve.

The contrast of this liberal system with the effete routine of colonial governance is entirely in her favour, because it serves to expose the abuses of her rivals, actuated always by their instincts of domination and conquest, and to give her the *rôle* of a patron and protector of local institutions, creating for her as compensation a privileged position.

After all, Germany is only applying in an improved and more highly developed form brought up more to the level of modern requirements the same principles which built up the commercial and industrial greatness of England, principles which the latter no longer seems to appreciate at their true value, influenced as she is by the cosmopolitan capitalism of the Jews, by the narrow-minded intolerance and Chauvinism of her officialdom and her colonial bureaucracy, aided by their accomplices—too much occupied with their own privileges and personal interests to warn the mother country of the dangers that threaten her.

Let us suppose for a moment that the East were to free herself to-morrow from all foreign control. Is it conceivable that she could on that account dispense with her commercial relations with the West? If she did so, what could she substitute for them? Besides, the very nature of the revindications put forth here on behalf of the East shows that they are not in any way economic in their character, and therefore any supposition such as that suggested above would be an absurdity. In fact, of all the relations subsisting between the East and the West, the only ones that are really normal and therefore durable are precisely these economic relations, because they are based on supply and demand, on production and consumption, and because

they are established under the sole obligation of real and reciprocal business requirements.

All this is so true that we find that these relations are the only ones that have conferred any benefits on the East and added to her material prosperity, at the same time remunerating liberally the industry and initiative of the West. These economic relations produced wealth by which everyone profited; and it is due to them that Western politicians can still perorate with some semblance of logic on the incalculable advantages of their civilising influence on the Moslem world, and complain of the ingratitude of the latter with regard to Europe.

The economic supremacy of Europe over the East will certainly survive her political domination, and will last as long as anything is destined to do in this world. The great current of the world's riches will probably take new directions; Hamburg and Bremen will perhaps supplant London and Liverpool, but the productive power of Europe as a whole will not be affected by that. The fate of colonial Powers then will depend on the wisdom and moderation of their conduct, on the vitality they will display in world-competition, and not on the violence they will use in stifling Pan-Islamism.

European obscurantism cannot therefore be defended under any pretext; its cause is the cause of the most narrow-minded and misconceived, therefore most injurious, egotism, and as such it is a cause that is indefensible.

All honour and glory to Pan-Islamism, which is combating it. May truth and justice light her path, and may the strength which she draws from her faith in her humanitarian mission triumph with the least possible delay over the obstacles which will be placed in her way!

BEHDJET WAHBY BEY.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY *cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER



No. CCCLXIV—June 1907

THE UNREST IN INDIA—ITS MEANING

In talking of the unrest in India we are apt to forget the new conditions which have arisen there within the last twenty-five years and which have effected a great change in the sentiments of large bodies of people and considerably altered the complexion of even ordinary affairs. The facility of travel, facility in the interchange of thought through the medium of a common language among those who have passed through the mill of the Government schools, to whatever part of the country they might belong; the disappearance to a great extent of those linguistic and racial divisions which formerly kept the inhabitants of the different provinces so widely apart; the community of traditions revived and rehabilitated, if not exclusively by English hands, under English influences; the intensification, in many cases, of religious and racial antipathies, have all conduced to a solidarity among certain sections of the population and given birth among many to ambitions and aspirations of which it is difficult for most outsiders to form an adequate conception.

As yet these feelings have not affected the masses or their natural leaders, to whom the language of modern democracy imported from the West makes no appeal, and who wish to develop India on con-

servative and indigenous lines. But no one can believe that either the one or the other can remain long untouched by the wave of nationalism which is passing over those classes who are most pervious to English influences and whose education is mostly English. The recent incidents in the Punjab, the outburst of anti-foreign feeling in other parts, are indications of the effect it can produce when sentiment and self-interest are invoked to inflame the passions and prejudices of the ignorant classes.

Remembering these facts, we cannot be surprised that, apart from any active propaganda, the feeling of discontent engendered in one province by an unpopular measure must re-act on the others. With the influences working unconsciously under the surface, not much engineering is needed to turn a local grievance into a 'national' trouble.

The far-sighted labour under no misapprehension as to the objects which many of the more enthusiastic have in view; they recognise the limitations under which for some considerable time the political development of India must proceed; and until now they seem to have kept within bounds the fiery spirits who have made independence from British dominancy the goal of their ambition. But apparently they have lost their hold on the movement which had hitherto been leading towards reform on constitutional lines. They have practically been pushed aside, let us hope only for the moment, by a new party which regards moderation as a sign of weakness.

Nationalism of the extreme type, exclusive, resourceful, and aggressive, is content no longer with the programme of its more thoughtful leaders. Judging from all the circumstances, it is evident, as remarked the other day by a competent authority whose sympathy is well known, that 'the extremists have gained the upper hand.' They will accept no boon from aliens and will have nothing to do with foreign domination.

When even a fragmentary part of a great conservative force like Hinduism adopts the disruptive methods of the West to extend its influence and paralyse controlling agencies it becomes an important element for consideration. There is, of course, no unanimity with respect to the means to attain the desired end. A war-cry invented in one province for a special purpose has penetrated to others widely apart; watchwords and tokens have come into existence. But between passive resistance to Government measures, general boycott of the English and English-made goods, and consequent disorganisation of British administration, and heroic methods of a still more undesirable kind, there is a great gulf. Whatever the means suggested, its advocates do not seem to perceive the immediate consequences of an agitation conducted on these lines for objects, which under existing conditions can hardly be regarded as feasible or conducive to the good of the people. And one of the first-fruits

of the present excitement has been to stiffen the backs of the African colonists against making any concessions to Indian settlers.

The influence for good and for evil of the students educated abroad is naturally great among their compatriots; many of them are highly gifted, all of them are keen-witted and well-educated. They would probably be the first to recognise that, however much *Swaraj* may be desirable in theory, India is not ripe yet to assume charge of her own destinies, and that for some time to come the present rule is a vital necessity for her.

Quite recently a writer in one of the English dailies remarked with characteristic arrogance that 'altruism is not an Oriental virtue.' Assuming that it is a Western virtue, if the British were altruistic enough to withdraw from India to-morrow, 'bag and baggage,' as the extremists suggest in the language of Mr. Gladstone, what is the alternative? Either anarchy or another foreign domination. And no one will hesitate to acknowledge that, whatever its faults, British rule is preferable to that of the Russians, French, Germans, or even the Americans.

Would it not be better to wait for the gradual evolution of a Government conformable to the sentiments of a *united* people, rather than by violent methods, or by virulent language calculated to inflame the minds of the ignorant masses, try to hurry the pace and retard the progress? The last fifty years since the British Crown assumed the direct sovereignty of India have witnessed changes which nobody living in the 'sixties could have conceived as possible. Another twenty-five years of peaceful development are certain to bring still greater advance. The hour-hand of Time cannot be stopped.

At this moment, however, the nationalistic feeling is so strongly anti-English that every counsel of moderation is certain to be received with a storm of indignation. Thus it is that even men who are convinced of the impolicy of violent methods and extravagance of language as likely to hinder the cause of reform and progress are obliged to run with the current.

The apathy with which the Indian Government has so long viewed the situation is difficult to explain. No one who has watched the course of events in Bengal can fail to observe how an agitation which, taken in hand at the right moment, might have been shorn of its most mischievous features, has been allowed to gain in intensity and acquire a bitterness which it is useless to disguise. Its genesis may be involved in doubt, its tendency cannot be mistaken. Warnings there were in plenty that a movement which began in opposition to an alleged unpopular measure was degenerating into a violent antagonistic propaganda against all aliens in race and creed. But they passed unheeded. An optimistic frame of mind views with impatience tinged with contempt any suggestion or opinion that does

not emanate from approved quarters, or come through accustomed channels.

Until now the source whence the agitation started gave colour to the official belief that it was ephemeral; that treated with mild doses of sympathy the symptoms would soon disappear. There was never any real attempt to diagnose the true cause of the excitement that so suddenly—to the official mind—had sprung up in Bengal. It was never understood, I venture to think, that the Partition, however strongly it may have touched the sentiments or interests of certain classes, could without other causes working at bottom have brought about that ebullition of feeling against foreign dominancy which has ever since been the prominent feature of Bengal politics.

The whole movement has been either treated with indifference or regarded as 'a' phase of national development that deserved encouragement. It was forgotten that what was mere effervescence in Bengal, translated to provinces inhabited by more virile races, has a different significance.

In the present condition of the country and the popular frame of mind the desire to placate may easily be construed into timidity, whilst spasmodic exhibitions of vigour are likely to create the belief that they are dictated by fear. What is needed is a consistent policy based on a true understanding of the causes of the unrest.

It would be folly to advocate the repression of the legitimate impulses of a nation towards a wider expansion of its capacities; it would be equally a folly to neglect the appearance of a new force which, although owing its birth to Western influences, is at this moment peculiarly anti-Western. But it would be more than folly to allow constitutional criticism of the measures of Government, constitutional endeavours for its improvement or reform, to degenerate into seditious exhortations and incitements to revolt, which might involve numberless innocent people in ruin and misery. No Government worth the name can allow liberty to degrade into licence to be used as an engine of oppression—for landlords to coerce tenants not to buy foreign goods, for irresponsible youths to prevent by force other people from following their legitimate trades and occupations or the bent of their own tastes. It would be the encouragement of a tyranny of the worst kind—a mob tyranny likely to involve different communities in violent conflicts.

When bands of 'national volunteers' are allowed to roam about the country to terrorise over law-abiding people the only explanation of the extraordinary situation is that the administration must have been seized with a sudden paralysis. And the news telegraphed from Simla that at a conference of Hindus and Mahommedans the Hindu leaders had accorded to the Mussulman subjects of his Majesty their permission to buy and sell English goods raises a smile at the weakness which could let things come to such a pass that one

section of the people should depend for the exercise of their rights and the enjoyment of their liberty on the toleration or sanction of another. The idea at the back of some minds that if the unpopular measure which has ostensibly induced the disorders were undone things would resume their normal course confuses cause and effect, and proceeds, it is submitted, on a misapprehension of the real nature of the complaint.

How the British Government will lay the Frankenstein it has raised remains to be seen. But no friend of India can view the present situation or the immediate future without the gravest anxiety. For centuries Hindus and Mahommedans have lived side by side in peace and amity. The fact that the latter had been displaced by their Hindu compatriots in Government consideration had made little or no difference in their general relations. Occasional disturbances between the rowdy spirits on both sides on certain festivals did not mar the normal harmony. Between the better minds of the two communities there existed, as I hope it still exists and lastingly, sincere friendship based on mutual respect and recognition of worth.

It is unfortunate that after nearly two hundred years of constant intercourse the Indian and European should not have come nearer; it is still more unfortunate that in certain directions the gulf should have widened. To suppose, however, that it has any connection with the Japanese victories is ludicrous. Industrial competition in recent years, with the influx of a large body of Europeans who in the days of the Company would have been treated as 'interlopers' rather deficient in the quality of sympathy with their environment, has no doubt something to do with the present feeling. This, however, does not sufficiently explain the fact. Schopenhauer, in one of his derisive moods, has said: 'Every miserable fool who has nothing at all of which he can be proud, adopts as a last resource pride in the nation to which he belongs.' I myself believe in racial pride, though it may be carried too far. The average Englishman of a certain class does not usually show in his best colours in Eastern lands, where everything around him is alien to his mind. With much natural kindliness of heart he combines an unveiled assumption of descent from a higher sphere, which, as can be imagined, is galling to races who are proud of their traditions. He makes no differentiation between class and class.

The complaint about political disability is a misunderstood phase of resentment at the stigma of racial inferiority. The general European attitude of superiority did not, however, interfere with individual cordiality. Christian missionaries were specially respected. They were the pioneers of English education among Hindu youths. It was from missionary institutions that came the men who distinguished themselves at the bar of the old Sudder Dewanny Adawlut and in the service of Government, and overflowed into the mercantile

offices. It was the start which the missionary institutions gave to English education among Hindu youths that gave them a superior advantage. It was a strange irony of fate that brought a Hindu mob upon inoffensive Christian pastors and missionaries the other day at Lahore.

In their endeavours to promote English education among the people and to develop among them the nationalistic spirit, the missionaries adopted a method which, however expedient from their point of view, has led to consequences which they themselves must regret. With the object of developing 'Christian culture,' as it was called, 'among the natives' the Mahommedan religion and Mahommedan rulers were persistently represented in an unfavourable light. The same method was afterwards adopted in Government institutions. There was no virtue in Mahommedan rule; the toleration and equal rights enjoyed by all classes under Akbar, Jehangir, and Shah Jehan were nominal; the Mahratta rising was a patriotic revolt against alien rulers! The ultimate tendency of these teachings on impressionable minds was lost sight of. Sivaji celebrations were not discouraged, as they only embodied sentiments of antipathy to Mahommedan rulers! Naturally, opprobrious epithets towards Mahommedans became common among certain classes. The result is what the veteran Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk described in his speech at Lucknow in response to Mr. Gokhale's invitation to the leading Mahommedans to throw in their lot with the Congress, that English education, by developing an exclusive and somewhat intolerant spirit of nationalism on one side, had done more than any other cause to estrange the two nationalities whose destinies are so intimately connected and on whose amicable co-operation in the work of progress and reform depends the whole future of India.

Nowhere were the relations between the two races more cordial than in Upper India; they spoke the same tongue, wrote in the same character, observed the same customs. In an unlucky moment an ill-conceived administrative order created a breach which there are grounds for fear may widen still further.

It was hardly to be expected that the antipathy unconsciously fostered against one alien rule, even though it might belong to the past, would not extend itself to any other dominancy.

Moderate people among all classes and creeds deplore the turn affairs have taken; they apprehend, not without reason, that it may seriously jeopardise the progress of the country and the introduction of reforms. Organs of public opinion, men of standing, all alike condemn the extravagance of language which has now become a source of public danger. But unfortunately their counsel does not seem to have much weight.[2] To judge even approximately of the tension

[2] The *Hindu Patriot*, the *Indian Social Reformer*, and the *Indian Mirror*, not to name others, are very decided in their condemnation of 'extremist' methods.

which prevails, one must belong to the country. If the official classes alone had been the objects of unpopularity, it might be thought that they were considered the unsympathetic instruments of an oppressive government. Unfortunately all Englishmen seem at the present moment to be objects of aversion; and the ignorant classes do not wait to make any difference between official and non-official, sympathiser and non-sympathiser. The term *Feringhee*, which formerly was applied only to Eurasians of low degree, is now the common appellation of all Europeans. Prominent Hindus may not maintain friendly relations with Europeans or entertain European friends without being subjected to serious annoyances and molestations. It is even said that the feeling has extended to the professional classes, which hitherto were wholly impervious to it. One can only trust that the report is not true.

Had this phase remained confined to one part of the country there would have been no difficulty in satisfactorily solving the problem, but its appearance in an aggravated form in a province inhabited by far more vigorous races naturally furnishes grounds for anxiety. It is true that a certain measure relating to the assessment of Government lands in what are called 'the Punjab colonies' has proved unpopular among the classes affected by it. Apparently there is some ground for complaint, and the objections of the *Zemindars* have, in a reasonable and moderate form, found expression in their journals. Their representations have already attracted the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, who seems to have taken steps to deal with the complaint in a sympathetic spirit.

It is difficult to believe that an unpopular measure alone could have imparted the peculiarly violent character to the outbreaks in the three principal cities of the Punjab, in the course of which the English missionaries, who have so often been the champions of the popular cause, should have been particularly singled out for maltreatment. Hitherto a Punjabi has not easily fraternised with an inhabitant of the Lower Provinces. Evidently the extremist feeling which is so pronounced in Bengal has made its way into the Punjab.

So far the fermentation does not appear to have spread in any acute form to the United Provinces. But few people think that they can long remain unaffected by the spirit which is passing over the land. Even if no efforts were made to drag them into the campaign, the feelings, hopes, and aspirations which are working in the neighbouring provinces must in the course of things produce their natural effect. To say that the situation does not require the highest statesmanship is to court disaster.

The unlucky coincidence which made the recent riots in the Punjab almost contemporaneous with the anniversary of those dark days when India was plunged in the horrors of bloodshed created among the nervously-inclined in England and elsewhere a feeling of alarm

and anticipation of trouble. This feeling was not likely to be allayed by the attempt, on the part of the 'Free India League,' to commemorate in London 'the Jubilee of the Patriotic Rising of 1857'! Whatever the motive which prompted the attempt, whether bravado or otherwise, it was deplorable. For the sooner that episode is forgotten the better, for both India and England.

One thing is certain, no such outburst as the great Mutiny is ever likely to recur. It is not the military resources at the command of Government which make it impossible; the causes which gave it birth are dead. The only force with which the administrator will have to reckon in the future is the strong nationalistic feeling which so many circumstances have combined to foster and stimulate. Wisely directed, it might become the means of great good to the people. It might encourage national education, develop national industry and enterprise; help in the cultivation of arts and literature. Misdirected, it is certain to cause incalculable harm, to plunge the country into strife and disorder; drive the Government to adopt unwelcome measures for the repression of disturbance to public peace, and render the administration on progressive and sympathetic lines impossible. But this seems to be the very object the militant section have set before themselves. They deride what they call the 'milk and water' programme of the Moderates. *Swaraj* is their dream, and in its pursuit they appear resolved to go to extremes. One has only to study the extremist literature with which the country is flooded, to judge, not only of their aims and the methods of their work, but also the efforts that are made to stimulate discontent with the present order of things.

I do not write as an alarmist; my sympathies are all on the side of progress and reform, and even the aspirations of nationalism within constitutional and legitimate limits. But I think that the man, particularly the statesman, who neglects the signs visible to the naked eye, will have a grave indictment to answer at the bar of history.

The character of the situation is thus pithily summed up by a distinguished Hindu graduate of the University of Columbia who is reported to have told his audience that 'Hindu civilisation was now pitted against English civilisation.'

The views of a prominent leader of the Congress expressed in an Indian newspaper on the causes of the unrest in Eastern Bengal were thought of sufficient importance to form the subject of a telegraphic communication to England. He considered that 'the unrest in Bengal is due to a belief which prevails among the more ignorant classes that the Government will support the Mahommedans against the Hindus.' And on this statement an English journal based this excellent homily, that 'this belief, until experience corrects it, will excite both sides to excesses.' What these 'excesses' are were explained the other day to the House of Commons by the Minister

responsible for the good government of India. I am not prepared to believe Mr. Dutt gave expression to the opinion with which he has been credited. But if he did so, I venture to think that he has done an injustice to those whom he calls 'the more ignorant classes.' The ferment, as he knows, is primarily due to men who can hardly be called 'ignorant,' and who would probably resent its application to them by anybody, except perhaps by one of their own leaders. The really 'ignorant classes' have no such belief, except where it may have been instilled into them by persons better acquainted with facts. The fomenters of the 'unrest' know perfectly well that Government has not the faintest notion of supporting the Mahommedans or showing them any undue favour. They know, as the Mahommedans know, that in its dealings with the Mussulmans it has always subordinated considerations of equity to expediency, that in deference to Hindu feelings it has maintained an impartial attitude which had this peculiar quality that it often inclined the scale towards the majority. Mr. Dutt's statement—if, indeed, he is correctly reported—seems very like the proverbial red herring trailed across the path of the timorous administrator. This dexterous attempt will probably have one effect, it will still more disincline the British Government to show consideration to Mahommedan claims or Mahommedan worth, lest at this juncture it might be construed into favouring the Mahommedans, and thus offend the sensitive feelings of these 'ignorant classes.'

The leading Mahommedans of Eastern Bengal, in conjunction with prominent Hindus, are striving to restore harmony between the two communities; but, judging from reports, malevolent endeavours are not wanting to nullify their efforts. So far the Mahommedans as a body have under the most trying circumstances exercised great self-restraint and moderation. They appear to have withstood all attempts to exasperate them or to goad them to put themselves in the wrong. They will probably have need in the future for still greater self-restraint and forbearance, and this need, I think, the leaders of the Mussulman community should carefully impress on the bulk of their people. They will gain nothing by losing self-control; they will only play into the hands of those who wish to create mischief. They must remember that in any disturbance, however provoked, they are more likely to receive harsher measures, lest leniency might be construed into favouritism. They must look to the law of the land for redress of grievance and protection from annoyance and provocation. Nor must they forget that in India particularly law is a game for the rich, and as a community they are not rich. For protection from persecution they must trust, as they have hitherto trusted, to the justice of British rule. It is impossible to suppose that, in spite of the volume of sound which drowns their claims, their voice will always remain unheard.

I have so long dwelt on the outward manifestations of a new force, though not altogether unprecedented in the history of India—a force full of momentous potentialities. Whether the movement can be turned into salutary channels must be a subject for anxious consideration to all, Indians and Englishmen alike, who are interested in the peaceful development of the country and people.

In my opinion neither temporary measures of repression nor of mere conciliation which gratify individual or sectional ambitions will have more than a passing effect. We know that when justice is on the alert the mischief-maker lies low; the moment its watchfulness is relaxed his machinations begin again. Repressive measures continuously applied breed ill-will and further the purpose of those whose object is to sow distrust in the minds of the people. Attempts to temporise or soothe feelings, factitious or real, are apt to be misconstrued; and the answers they bring sound like the cry of 'the daughters of the horse-leech.'

As a remedy for the unrest in the country, it was recently suggested by an eminent Indian, whose position lends weight to his opinions, that a member of the Royal Family of England nearly connected to the throne should be sent to India as a Regent for the same term of years as an ordinary civilian. He was, however, to act merely as a figure-head without any hand or part in the actual administration. The office of Viceroy was to be abolished, and instead there was to be a Prime Minister whose functions would not be dissimilar. Although the idea was cleverly propounded and seems by its novelty to have caught the fancy of some, it is difficult to see how the Regency —whatever attractions it might possess for Rajahs and Nawabs— would achieve the desired result. With all respect, the suggestion misses not only the nature of the complaint for which the remedy is prescribed, but also the difficulties which surround its application.

The problem which faces the Government requires consideration from a broader standpoint. It is not enough to apply palliatives without endeavouring to get at the root of the mischief. The first effort no doubt should be to restore order and to give effective protection to law-abiding subjects of the Crown. The policy of letting things slide, of coquetting with malevolence, must be abandoned. But, without relaxing for a moment the attitude of watchfulness or ceasing to repress disorders and open or covert incitements to sedition, steps should be taken to neutralise the propaganda of ill-will and racial feud by inviting all people interested in the maintenance of peace and good government to assist in the restoration of better feeling and harmonious relations between the different communities.

The Mahommedan historian of India, writing under the auspices of the first English Governor-General, describes thus the cordial relations which, in the course of centuries, had grown up between the Hindus and Mahommedans.

And although the Gentoos seem to be a generation apart and distinct from the rest of mankind, and they are swayed by such differences in religion, tenets, and rites, as will necessarily render all Mussulmen aliens and profane in their eyes; and although they keep up a strangeness of ideas and practices which beget a wide difference in customs and actions, yet in process of time they drew nearer and nearer, and as soon as fear and aversion had worn away we see that this dissimilarity and alienation have terminated in friendship and union, and that the two nations have come to coalesce together into one whole, like milk and sugar that have received a simmering. In one word, we have seen them promote heartily each other's welfare, have common ideas, like brothers from one and the same mother, and feel for each other, as children of the same family.

It is not so very long ago that the cordiality, goodwill, and sympathy, so quaintly described, were general among all classes and not confined to the cultivated sections. They visited each other, joined in each other's amusements, and as neighbours and friends maintained constant intercourse. The change that the last two decades have worked is most marked. And the refusal of the Mahommedans to join the boycott movement has intensified among the more violent the antipathy of recent growth artificially fostered. In spite of the present differences, it is my firm belief that with a little devotion and self-sacrifice on the part of the best men on both sides who have a clearer insight into the needs and requirements of India, and who are not swayed by passions and prejudices, the same old relations can be re-established.

The first duty, however, seems to be to bring the official classes in touch with the people in order to promote mutual understanding, and to neutralise, to some extent, the teachings of racial animosity. The aloofness of Europeans in their general relations with Eastern people, and the inaccessibility of British officials, had, as early as 1787, formed the subject of criticism among the educated classes of India. The same writer whom I have quoted above, commenting on the conditions under the Mogul emperors and those under the Company, says:

Hence those princes lived amongst their people and amongst their nobles, as kind and condescending parents amongst their children; nor did they suffer the dust of sorrow to darken the heart of any of the creatures of God by a show of tenderness to one part of the people and of rudeness to the other; for they looked upon them all, whether conquerors or conquered, with an equal eye.

To this the English translator adds the following note:

The Emperors of Hindostan used to give public audience twice a week, and were imitated by all their lieutenants and governors; whereas the charge of inaccessibleness brought against Europeans by their Indian subjects is founded on matter of fact and on daily experience, although, after all, the charge is exaggerated.

The example of Warren Hastings and many of his notable successors led to the adoption of a system of weekly durbars held by

British officials for the reception of local magnates and prominent people. But as the administration became more complicated it gradually fell into disuse. Nowadays the overworked officer has less time, and probably fewer opportunities, to come in contact or cultivate personal relations with the people over whom he is placed. The gulf which so often separates the two to the disadvantage of both might be bridged, if the old practice were resumed with broader sympathy and a better comprehension of the results that might be attained thereby. A day might be set apart by the head of the district or sub-division to receive not only magnates and persons of education and standing, but also headmen of villages.

There need be no fear as to the derogation of authority or respect in consequence of any unbending, in these efforts. The Indian, whatever his rank in life, hardly ever fails in his respect to his superiors. Of course, the revolutionary wave we are witnessing has slackened the bonds of authority and weakened the old reverence for age and position. But to command respect is a matter of personal equation; and few officers, English or Indian, would be found deficient in that quality. I believe, if some effort were made to bring about a change in the relations of the people with the official classes, it would prove of the greatest help in removing much of the ill-will that has recently grown up among certain classes against British rule.

It is unfortunate that there is no efficient means of counteracting the deleterious influences to which many students coming from India are subjected on arrival in this country. In former years, when they were few in number, they brought introductions to personal friends of parents and relations, and generally came under the best guidance and saw the best side of English life. English society was less exclusive in those days—and its portals were open not merely to the rich. If the students were gentlemen and well educated they frequently found an entry into good circles. The situation has completely altered within the last twenty-five or thirty years. The influx of students for training and education has become greater. Courtesy to them is now regarded as the fad of the philanthropist or the duty of the Anglo-Indian official. The students have societies of their own, mostly political in character. They are often members of English clubs which advocate advanced politics. They imbibe here the lessons of political philosophy which England teaches with such success to the rest of the world. They return to their homes with not very kindly sentiments towards the somewhat autocratic government which rules their country.

Would it not be a wise policy for the Indian Government to assist the associations which are working so assiduously to promote the interests of India and her people—to establish a non-political club where Indian students would meet Englishmen and their own countrymen residing in England and acquire that spirit of frank camaraderie,

forbearance and moderation so essential in after life; where also they might cultivate an eclectic mind which would reconcile Eastern and Western civilisation? And perhaps some means might be found for the British Ministers at Washington and Tokio to come in touch with the Indian students who are now flocking in large numbers to Japan and the United States for technical training and general education.

To promote the establishment of better relations between Hindus and Mahommedans I would suggest the formation of social clubs where educated members of the two communities might meet for purposes of friendly intercourse and reunion. There is no dearth among either people of public-spirited men willing to undertake the task of forming such societies. And if the same recognition which is now accorded to rich men founding schools and dispensaries were extended to those who interested themselves in the formation and maintenance of friendly clubs, we would soon see no lack of enterprise in this direction.

With a similar object the *akharas* which have recently sprung up in Eastern Bengal to teach the youths of the provinces the hitherto unaccustomed and unpopular art of plying the lethal weapon might be converted into students' clubs for self-improvement; whilst the practice among young students of carrying daggers and sword-sticks, pistols and revolvers, which offers such strong incentives to rowdyism, might, however gently, be discouraged.

These suggestions are offered in all diffidence as the result of a long study of a problem the solution of which is becoming daily more and more difficult. Some might seem weak, others hardly feasible. But, whatever view may be held with regard to them, in my opinion the time has come when steps must be taken to reach the heart of the *people*.

AMEER ALI.

ARE CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA A FAILURE?

It is often asserted quite confidently, by people whose opinions are entitled to respect, that mission work in India during the last century has been a failure. And undoubtedly they can appeal to many facts which would seem to prove that they are right. The main efforts of nearly all missionary societies have been directed towards the conversion of the Brahmins, higher castes and educated classes of Hindu society in the larger towns and cities. When I first went out to Calcutta, twenty-three years ago, it was the general belief that Christianity must, as a matter of course, first establish itself in the great centres of commerce, education and political life, and then from them spread out to the villages; and that it must first win the higher castes and educated men, and from them permeate down to the lower strata of society. That has been the plan of campaign for the last sixty or seventy years, and, naturally, missions stand or fall in the eyes of the public by its success or failure. But it would certainly be difficult to prove that it has been a conspicuous success. The number of converts from among the higher castes has been extremely small, the power of the caste system remains unbroken, and the antagonism to Christianity is almost as strong as ever. No doubt there has been a general diffusion of Christian ideas and sentiments among the higher castes, and the majority of educated men have imbibed a sincere admiration for the human life and character of Christ; but against anything like the acceptance of the Christian creed the higher ranks of Hindu society present a solid and unbroken front. So far as I can judge, they are no nearer to the Christian Church to-day than they were twenty-five years ago; indeed, in some respects, I think that they are further off. The advance of higher education has perceptibly increased the friction and antagonism between Europeans and Indians, and this has necessarily reacted strongly upon the attitude of educated Indians towards Christianity. To anyone, then, who looked exclusively at this part of the mission work, it might well appear that Christian missions in India for the last fifty years have been almost a complete failure. And this is

precisely the part of the work that looms large in the eyes of Europeans living in India and visitors from Europe. Their time is passed in the larger towns and cities, or in the military cantonments, where they see something of the local missions, and, if they are of a religious turn, make friends with the missionaries and their wives. Then they go back to England and say that they have lived for some forty years or travelled for some four months in India, have studied the work of Christian missions in many different places, have talked to the missionaries themselves and to the educated and intelligent natives, and can state positively from what they have seen and heard that missions are a failure. And what they say is largely true, *so far as it goes.* They see the attacks which have been made for the last fifty years upon positions of almost impregnable strength, and they are substantially right in saying that these attacks have failed. It would not, indeed, be true to say that they have done no good and effected nothing. On the contrary, they have done an immense service to the cause of Christianity in India. But, at the same time, they undoubtedly have failed so far as the main purpose of Christian missions is concerned, viz. the winning of converts to faith in Christ and the building up of the Christian Church.

But now let us look to another part of the field and see what has been going on during the last fifty years in remote village districts, where few Europeans ever penetrate, and among classes of the population which European travellers and the vast majority of European residents in India know nothing about. A few statistics taken from the returns of the Government census reports will serve to show that something has been going on there which, judged by its outward results, certainly does not look like failure. In the Telugu country to the north of the Madras Presidency the number of Christians increased from 19,132 in 1871 to 222,150 in 1901. Here we have an increase of over 200,000 in thirty years, or over 6,000 converts a year. In the native States of Travancore and Cochin the Christians form a third of the whole population, and according to the Government census their numbers rose from about 738,000 in 1881 to 896,000 in 1901. Here again we find an increase of nearly 160,000 in twenty years, or about 8,000 a year. In Chhota Nagpur, in Bengal, there were only about 40,000 Christians in 1881, and there were over 144,000 in 1901, an increase of 104,000 in twenty years.

The idea, then, that Christian missions have been a failure has only been possible because both their friends and critics have had their eyes fixed on just that part of the work which has been to a large extent unprogressive. But how great the progress has been in the village districts is shown by the simple fact that during the decade between the Government census of 1891 and the census of 1901, while the population of India as a whole increased at the rate

of 1½ per cent., on the other hand the native Christians increased at the rate of over 30 per cent. And if we separate off the Roman Catholics, who form about one-half of the total number in South India and increase very slowly, we find the remarkable fact that the rate of increase of the Protestant native Christians between 1891 and 1901 was over 50 per cent., or thirty-three times as great as the rate of increase of the whole population.

I cannot guarantee the exact accuracy of the census returns, but I know for certain that these figures represent actual movements on a large scale which are going on silently and steadily all over India. The upper castes and the educated classes of Hindu society in towns and cities have made little or no response to the preaching of the Gospel. That is true. But at the other end of the social scale, the lower castes, the out-castes and the aboriginal tribes are being gathered in to the Church in large masses. And the reason is obvious. The great obstacle to the conversion of the upper ranks of society is the impenetrable barrier of caste. The social system inflicts such tremendous penalties on conversion to Christianity that a convert from the higher castes is truly a miracle. But at the other end of society, caste, with its iron bondage and oppressive tyranny, simply drives men wholesale into the arms of the Christian Church. The movement towards Christianity among these classes, therefore, is not wholly or even mainly a spiritual one. To a very large extent it is social. Social tyranny supplies a strong motive power which leads men to look to the Christian Church as a saviour and deliverer. For the last two or three thousand years the pariah of Hindu society has been regarded with the utmost contempt and abhorrence, kept deliberately in a state of hopeless poverty and degradation, and treated like an unclean animal. Suddenly the Christian Church has come to him in his misery, taken him by the hand, shielded him from oppression, striven to educate him and improve his lot, treated him with kindness and Christian love, and taught him that he is a son of God. The pariah is not a theologian, nor is he a person of lofty moral and spiritual ideals; but he is quite capable of judging between Christianity and Hinduism by their fruits, and I do not think that Christ Himself would condemn him for doing so. His motive in becoming a Christian may not be very lofty, but neither, on the other hand, is it a low or unworthy one. In judging of movements of this kind we need to clear our minds of cant, and not condemn in the pariah desires for social advancement which we regard as laudable and honourable among ourselves. Nor must we assume that movements of this kind are ever the result of any one single motive. The causes that lead to them are nearly always of a complex character: there is the desire to escape from social tyranny, the desire for social advancement, the attractive power of Christian kindness and sympathy, and the vague feeling after God which lies at the root even of the

weird rites and revolting ceremonies of the village worship.[1] And it is always difficult to say, in any given movement, which of these motives is most prominent and to which the movement is mainly due.

But even the lowest of them are not bad reasons for preferring Christianity to Hinduism. If Hindu society treats men as dogs, and the Christian Church treats them as human beings, I do not imagine that they are greatly to be blamed, even from the most philosophic point of view, for taking this as a rough-and-ready proof that Christianity is a more desirable religion than Hinduism. The importance of these movements, then, cannot be discounted simply because it is undoubtedly true that these classes of men have nothing to lose and much to gain by becoming Christians. They reveal to us the weak spot of Hindu society and the great work of the Christian Church in India in the immediate future. There are, upon a rough calculation, about twenty million pariahs and aborigines in the whole of India. And the experience of the last century has shown that within the next fifty years it would be quite possible to convert them nearly all to Christianity, and build them up into a strong and progressive Christian community, that would have a decisive influence upon the social and religious life of every village throughout the length and breadth of the land.

It is often said, I know, that the ultimate effect of these mass movements is unsatisfactory; that the people come over to the Church from mixed motives, and soon sink down to a state of spiritual deadness and apathy. But that is not my experience. It is quite true that very often these movements have been mismanaged or ignored, that a weak staff of European missionaries has been left to cope with a large influx of new converts, that no care has been taken to provide a proper number of well-trained native teachers and pastors, and that the education of both adults and children has been neglected. Where this is the case the movement naturally comes prematurely to an end and the moral and spiritual results in the Christian community itself are disappointing, or even disastrous. But when the new converts are properly cared for and the movement is wisely guided the moral results are most striking. As I travel about among the villages where these mass movements are going on, I am astonished at the signs of progress in education, social life, morality and religion which I see among our poor Christians. It is difficult to state the real proofs of progress; but no one who has had any experience of a mission of this kind, where the converts are properly taught and trained, can doubt for a moment that the difference between Christians and non-Christians of the same class is simply the difference between light and darkness. The wonderful reverence of a village congregation at a Confirmation or at the Holy Communion is an experience that

[1] See article on 'The Village Deities of South India' in the October (1906) number of this Review.

one does not easily forget, and, when placed in contrast with the bloody rites and wild orgies that make up the ritual of the village deities, it illustrates more vividly than words can describe the difference between the crude and coarse superstitions of Hinduism and the spiritual worship of the Christian Church. And when we say that these people have nothing to lose and everything to gain by becoming Christians, and that their conversion involves no sacrifice, we forget what it means for them to abandon their old superstitions. Often, when all the pariahs of a village become Christians, they are required before they are received as catechumens, as a mark of sincerity, to pull down their old heathen shrine and build a Christian prayer-house in its place. It is difficult for us to realise what a moral and spiritual effort this demands on the part of poor, ignorant people, who have been steeped from childhood in the grossest superstition. Very touching it often is to see how each man tries to put the responsibility on someone else. They generally ask the missionary to do it. When he tells them they must do it themselves, they try to get the head-man to begin, and he in turn gives orders to the rest, till at last some man, bolder than the others, takes his courage in both hands and sets about the work of destruction. And then sometimes there is a pathetic touch of humour in the superstitious fear that recurs when the deed is done. In one village all the people except one man agreed to the destruction of the shrine. After holding out for a long time, he at last consented, and then the shrine was pulled down. Next morning his cow gave no milk! It seemed an obvious sign of the wrath of the goddess, and the shrine was hastily rebuilt the next day. It was some time before the people could be brought to shake off their fears and once more pull down the shrine. These may seem to us trifling or even humorous facts; but these victories over superstitious fears, that have dominated the minds of these poor people for thousands of years, form steps towards moral freedom that might well be compared to the release of Israel from Egyptian bondage.

I do not say for a moment that they attain to any high standard of morality or religion in one, two, or three generations. It would be unreasonable to expect it. They are full of faults and vices, often of the grossest character; but I do assert, from what I have seen myself, that when they become Christians they show a capacity for progress which separates them off by a wide gulf from the Hindus among whom they live. My own experience in South India would certainly lead to the conclusion that, taken as a whole, the native Christians are the only community in South India that are steadily advancing in morality and religion, or who can be said to have any definite ideal of moral and religious progress in the future. It is, after all, to these mass movements towards Christianity from below that we must look for the regeneration of Indian society. It may seem a strange and paradoxical idea that the future of India lies in

the hands, not of the Brahmin, but of the pariah. Yet I believe that it is true. No social progress in India is remotely possible until the tyranny of caste is crushed and destroyed, and if the history of the past fifty years is any guide to the future, that will be brought about, not by the gradual enlightenment of the Brahmins, but by the uprising of the pariahs and aborigines through the influence of Christianity. It was said of the first preachers of Christianity that they turned the world upside down. The same might be said now of the Christian missionaries in India. They are turning society upside down, and rapidly bringing about a great social revolution. It is their work in the conversion and elevation of the poor and out-castes that is paving the way for the progress and civilisation of the future.

HENRY MADRAS.

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION AND SWADESHI'

A FEW years ago in an article in this Review,[1] on the masterpiece of Mogul art, the Taj at Agra, I ventured to draw attention to the importance, from an imperial point of view, of Englishmen studying and trying to understand the artistic ideals of the East, for, I said, the Indian Question, which then seemed smaller than a man's hand, might fill the Eastern horizon to-morrow. I may, perhaps, without posing as a prophet, quote this as an example of how in the East the unexpected is always happening, for to-day Indian and Eastern questions loom in our political sky as large as Home Rule for Ireland —which to stay-at-home politicians, who make no attempt to grasp the significance of Eastern problems, may seem a monstrously overdrawn comparison.

To many others whose education and environment have taught them to regard art as external to the serious affairs of life, and only a pleasant amusement for hours of leisure, it may not be easy to understand the connection between art and politics, or to trace the coming of the Japanese into the front rank of modern nations to their marvellous artistic instinct. Yet a mere cursory view of history will show that the nations with the greatest artistic record have always been those whose political Empire has been the greatest and most lasting. Their rise and decay may be traced without any other documents than those their art has left in marble, stone and brick, in metal, wood and clay. Unless, therefore, we are right and all the centuries wrong, or unless the natural instinct for beauty hitherto inherent in human nature is going to be satisfactorily replaced by something else not yet manifested, it is evident that art is an index to national vitality, and cannot be left out of account by politicians whose ideas rise above a county council or the exigencies of party manœuvres.

No Anglo-Indian statesman has fully understood the administrative uses of art. Akbar, whose rule presents many analogies to our own, showed his marvellous political genius more conspicuously in his understanding of art than in the organisation of the machinery

[1] 'The Taj and its Designers,' June 1903.

by which he collected his revenues, or in his measures for securing justice and social order. Wherever the monuments of Akbar's reign exist, Hindu, Jain, Buddhist and Muhammadan alike testify to the gladness and contentment which his benevolent despotism brought to the people. In this record of national art those who have eyes to see can see that Akbar achieved—what so far we have not succeeded in winning—a sincere understanding between the rulers and the ruled, a sentiment deeper than respect or astonishment. It is just that note of gladness which we have failed to evoke. We bring with us into India the dull, grey northern skies, and in spite of all that we have done we are still looked upon by most Indians as stern and strict schoolmasters, rather than as friends and fellow-citizens of the Empire. This comes chiefly from our failure to grasp the fundamental fact that art is a far more important matter of State policy in India than it is in Europe—just because in India art is still the voice of the people. To be out of touch with a people's art is to be out of touch with the people.

The discipline which we have imposed upon India has been—at least for the time being—a great blessing, but the dulness is not an essential part of the discipline. Our Indian Empire is now held by a departmental machinery so immense and so complex that no administrator in modern times has been able to do what Akbar did. Lord Curzon attempted it and might have succeeded, were it not that by the peculiar system through which we govern our Indian Empire India is deprived of his services just when his work was beginning. His wonderful energy and intellectual powers have done much to improve the machinery, but that welding of the administrative system on to the national life, which Akbar achieved and which we must achieve before we can regard India as an integral part of the British Empire, has still to be done. Lord Curzon, moreover, is, unfortunately for India, an ardent archaeologist. I say this without disrespect and without the least intention of depreciating the splendid work which he has done in restoring Indian monuments. It was a work to which Lord Curzon devoted the best of his great intellect and artistic sympathy, and no artist can have other than the most sincere admiration for the results. But in seven years Lord Curzon had not time to realise what no Anglo-Indian administrator has yet learnt in a lifetime—that in India art is not archaeology. What Lord Curzon failed to do in seven years his successors can hardly hope to do in five; so, although the Taj, the palaces of the Moguls, and many other splendid monuments of India's past bear the mark of Lord Curzon's great personality, Indian art remains where it was—on the road to ruin—unless 'Swadeshi' should come to the rescue.

It says much for the thoroughness and enthusiasm with which Lord Curzon did his work that at the end of his seven years' labours

he succeeded in digging through the surface layers on which most of our Indian administrative system is built, and struck against the bed-rock of what we may call Indian nationality, though that word fails to express exactly what Swadeshi is. It may be that he did so unconsciously, but, nevertheless, if through his action he has prepared the way for a more solid and enduring foundation on which the administrative fabric may be built, Lord Curzon deserves well of the Empire.

In discussing Swadeshi it is necessary to distinguish between the true Swadeshi and the false, and it may be said at once that Manchester can laugh at the false one, and need not fear the true, for a happy and prosperous India is Manchester's best friend. India has need of the method of Manchester as well as the artistic sense of Swadeshi. The false Swadeshi is just now the most conspicuous, for it is noisy and self-assertive. It preaches thinly-veiled sedition and talks largely of patriotism, though it is as absurd to speak of patriots of India as it would be to speak of patriots of Europe. It will help a decaying national industry when it can be used as a political lever, but will leave it to starve and die out when it does not serve that purpose. Its methods are generally hollow, unpractical and insincere; but though it justly deserves our contempt we should never forget that it is largely the product of our own educational system.

The true Swadeshi keeps aloof from the official administration, and neither joins in the scramble for official favours nor apes the noisy manner of the Western demagogue. It lives its own life apart from ours, and many Anglo-Indians spend a lifetime in India hardly conscious of its existence. You may see its various outward manifestations on the ghâts at Benares, and learn that though there are many formularies—Hindu, Sikh, Jain, Buddhist and Muhammadan—it has one ideal. That ideal is so different from ours that few Europeans attempt to understand it, and few would succeed in less than a cycle of transmigrations. It is something more than nationality. It is the Eastern way of thinking. This Swadeshi is not disloyal, though it has its sinister aspect, which it revealed in 1857. It is not for us; but it is grateful for the *pax Britannica*, and realises its value. It bides its time; it has faith in the centuries—*and, unless all Indian history lies, the centuries are on its side.*

It is this Swadeshi which, from the time the Aryans entered into India, has absorbed one conquering race after another without materially altering its way of thinking. It is an immense political force, now passive on the whole, but getting more active every day, for its strength, which was dissipated by a long period of anarchy and misrule, is being slowly recruited under our firm and stable government. We, to a certain extent, like Akbar, found our Indian system of revenue, law and police upon it, but in many vital matters in which art is concerned, such as industrial development, public works, and

national education, we almost completely ignore it. It is in the matter of industrial development that Swadeshi has lately shown a remarkable activity and drawn European attention to the fact of its existence. How little our Anglo-Indian departmentalism has been aware of this side of Swadeshi is shown by the fact that until a few years ago official statistics referred to Anglo-Indian cotton mills, which give employment to only 350,000 people, as representing the most important industry in India after agriculture. Not long ago an official, considered a high authority on industrial matters, lectured to an Anglo-Indian audience in London and described the hand-weaving industry of India as almost driven out of the market—the fact being that it still supports directly and indirectly, not thousands, but millions of Indian villagers. The hand industry is not only of far greater importance than the whole of the steam-power factories put together, but contributes largely towards their support by purchasing the greater part of the yarn which the Indian steam mills produce.

The concentration of labour and machinery rendered necessary by the use of steam power, the struggle of the agricultural labourer for 'bettering' himself, and of the capitalist to add to his capital, have given Lancashire its steam mills in which, according to a competent authority, the weaving industry is carried on under conditions unhealthy and dangerous, bad for mind and body, making women unfit for motherhood, cursing the children and causing the people to deteriorate. The remarkable development of hand-loom weaving in the last twenty years does not support the popular belief that the power loom will drive out the hand loom altogether even in Europe. In India, after 150 years of fighting with obsolete weapons against all the resources of European mechanical science, the almost forgotten hand-loom industry is still a highly organised and very formidable industrial army. This is because in the first place heredity makes the Indian caste weaver a highly skilled artisan, and secondly, because his Swadeshi way of thinking does not give the Indian labourer that passion for mere money-making which the West calls laudable ambition. The Indian people, the true Swadeshi, are at heart philosophical and deeply religious. Every peasant believes that if he is faithful to his *dharma* (his duty to God and the State) in this life, his *karma* (his place in the cosmos) may make him a king in the next re-birth. Why then should he struggle for mere wealth in this? So the high wages of modern industrialism—which in Europe draw the life-blood of nations to the great cities—in India attract only the scum of the population. Only when starvation drives him to the famine-camp or to the cities will the peasant leave his plough and the skilled weaver his loom.

The agitation against the partition of Bengal has brought to the aid of the Indian hand-loom weaver all the forces of Swadeshi,

both the real and the sham, and bids fair to solve in a twelvemonth a problem which has puzzled departmentalism for fifty years—technical education for India. The despised occupation of weaving has become one which attracts the intelligence of the highest castes. The best appliances of modern Europe are being brought to replace the primitive apparatus of the village hand-loom weaver, who suddenly finds himself in great demand as a teacher for Brahmins and Vaishyas and for 'failed B.A.s' of the Calcutta University. One of Lord Curzon's last acts as Viceroy was to sanction for Bengal an important scheme for a school of hand-loom weaving on the best modern lines—a stroke of policy worthy of the best traditions of Anglo-Indian statesmen, which will help to turn many disaffected agitators into loyal and industrious citizens. The Indian weaving industry will thus be able to face the competition of nineteenth-century factories on more equal terms. The latest improvements in the application of mechanical power all tend to make the concentration of labour in these social pest-houses less and less a necessity for modern industrial methods. It is more than probable that before many decades have passed modern science will place at the disposal of the Indian village weaver, in a simple and effective form, as much power as he may want to use. Thus the centuries even now are helping Swadeshi.

Let us now discuss Swadeshi in relation to public works. For the last fifty years departmentalism has entrusted the whole construction of public works and with it the whole art interests of India to a body of engineers who have had no artistic training. I say 'whole art interests' advisedly, for if all the schools of art in India were closed to-morrow Indian art would be hardly a whit the worse—or better. Art museums as they have been always conducted may give a spasmodic impulse to a passing caprice of fashion in Europe and America, by advertising so-called Indian art ware. But, unfortunately, most of the art collected in Indian museums and exhibitions is made solely for the European market. It is an art which from its falseness can never have a permanent commercial value, and it is not in any sense the art of the people. A permanent revival of Indian art, either in a commercial or artistic sense, can never be produced by such methods as these.

The monopoly of architectural art which the Indian Public Works Department has assumed, and the curse of a false classicism which it has brought with it from Europe, are the principal causes of the decay of the real art of the country. The complacency with which Anglo-Indian administrators have regarded the ineptitude of this policy is partly, no doubt, a recognition of the splendid and devoted services of Public Works officers in the construction of railways and irrigation works, but it is mainly due to the ineradicable superstition that European architecture is better adapted

to modern requirements, and that though Indian architects may have excelled in the aesthetic side of their profession, they are far behind the times in all that relates to constructional science. We form our ideas of Indian art from the precious inlay of the Taj or from the exuberant carving of Jain and Hindu temples. But do we generally take the mosaic of St. Mark's at Venice as the criterion of the cost of a post-office, or form the estimates of a hospital on the carving of a Gothic cathedral? Indian architects, like those of medieval Europe, know how to be economical when economy is wanted, though they disregard economy when it is neither becoming nor necessary. In other words they are trained in all the requirements of their profession.

It is doubtless true that Indian builders of the present day know little of the use of iron for building purposes, but it is important to remember that brick, stone, and wood have not yet been entirely superseded as building materials in India, either by iron, glass, papier-maché, sawdust or any other of the up-to-date resources of Western architects. In the purely constructional use of these old-fashioned materials all that European builders have achieved, whether in classic, medieval, or modern times, has been equalled or excelled by Indian architects; and it is highly probable that if Anglo-Indian engineers had attempted to study and make use of the traditional craftsmanship of centuries which the descendants of these men keep alive, they would have learnt something of the artistic possibilities of iron girders, for the native builders, instinctively, will use even corrugated iron and kerosene tins more artistically than we do.

We pride ourselves on being a practical nation, and the popular excuse for any act of vandalism, or any peculiarly stupid artistic abomination, is that art must give way to considerations of utility. Yet when art becomes a question of public policy, we are probably the most unpractical and irrational of all civilised nations. We have certainly exhibited ourselves in that light in India, both before and since Great Britain assumed imperial responsibility for the government of the country. Some time ago I met in Calcutta a Prussian State engineer, sent out officially to India by his Government to study the constructive principles of Indian architecture. Our Teutonic friends are more practical than ourselves. It was an English chemist who discovered aniline dyes. The Germans forthwith appropriated the discovery, and built up a gigantic German industry upon it. Now they are rapidly taking from us the Indian indigo trade. Englishmen opened the door to Sanscrit literature, but German scholars placed the study of it on a scientific basis, and when we want Principals for the few Indian colleges where Oriental literature is a special study, we must generally send to Germany for them. A Scotchman, James Fergusson, spent forty years of his life in exploring the marvellous field of architectural research, scientific and artistic, which our Indian

Empire affords. His labours have been lost on Indian departmentalism, and it seems likely that the Germans again will be the first European nation to profit by his life-work.

Indian departmentalism consistently shuts its eyes to the fact that India still has a national art. England had one two centuries ago, and is now seriously attempting to revive it, but the national culture which was the product of centuries cannot be restored in a day. Mr. Edward S. Prior, in a monograph on the Cathedral Builders of England,[2] which should be a text-book for all who wish to understand Indian art, has described the process by which the classicism of the Italian Renaissance and that peculiar product of modern times, archaeological art, have destroyed the traditional, national art of Europe, just in the same way as the national art of India is now being destroyed by departmentalism. He has shown how in every country and every epoch before the eighteenth century a national architecture was created by trained bodies of craftsmen, organised like the artisan castes of India, so that every building was a school of painting, sculpture and engineering—of art and of craft; every cathedral, church, palace, or mansion, a human document in which was written the life of the nation; every public building in its stability, durability, and beauty, a symbol of the power and dignity of the State. Then came the era of paper architects, of archaeologists and rabid commercialism. So instead of a national art which was a joyous worship of the Creator in the daily work of the people—for the cottager as well as for the King—we have now an art for 'best parlours' and 'at homes'; an art for museums and exhibitions; an art for the scholar, too absorbed in the dust-heaps of the past to concern himself with the beauty of the present; an art for the merchant, too busy with his money-bags to worship God on week-days.

In India we have now an exactly similar process leading to exactly similar results, only carried on with greater ruthlessness and less artistic understanding, for we have in India no Christopher Wren or Inigo Jones to give us brilliant essays in archaeological architecture. India still possesses a large body of trained craftsmen who practise the art of building on similar principles and produce similar results to those of the great medieval builders of Europe. They enter no University, for Indian Universities were founded for supplying material for the official machinery, and make no provision for either art or religion. But their ancestors built the Taj, the shrines of Mount Abu, and countless other masterpieces; they constructed the Mogul palaces, public offices, irrigation works, and everything of practical utility that the art of building could provide.

How does our departmentalism provide for these needs to-day? A certain number of young men, with no training either in art or in craft, learn by heart certain formularies for calculating the maximum

[2] *The Portfolio*, No. 46, November 1905.

weight which an iron girder will bear, the smallest dimensions to which a wall can be reduced without collapsing, the cheapest rate at which a building can be constructed so as to bring it within the annual departmental budget. When a department has settled on paper the plan of the building it wants, one of these engineers with an archaeological turn of mind puts on to it a 'Gothic' or 'Classic' front, according to departmental taste, and provides a certain scale of departmental decoration according to departmental rank and dignity. Then the hereditary Indian craftsman whose family has practised the art of building for untold centuries is brought in to learn the wisdom of the West by copying the departmental paper patterns. How bad the art becomes is, perhaps, difficult to be understood by those to whom an archaeological solecism is more offensive than an artistic eyesore; but it is easy to explain how wasteful and extravagant the system really is. To build one of the latest and perhaps the best of these archaeological structures in Calcutta, a large number of Indian caste-builders were employed. Many of them were both artists and craftsmen—they could design, build, and carve. The structural design had been settled for them departmentally, so they had no concern with that. There was also a considerable amount of ornament to be carved, but that also had been designed for them in proper departmental style, which happened to be Italian Renaissance, so they were not allowed to attempt that. Other men who had been trained in the European archaeological style in Bombay were brought over to copy mechanically the paper patterns prepared for them. These men were paid two rupees a day each. Now there are at the present time in the Orissa district, not far from Calcutta, and famous for its splendid native architecture, a considerable number of masons and builders who, within the last twenty years, have designed and carried out architectural decoration comparable with that of our finest medieval buildings in Europe, and infinitely more beautiful than the imitation Renaissance ornament of the building I have referred to. The average earnings of these men is four annas a day, or one-eighth of the wages paid for executing the departmental decoration. They and their fellow-artists all over India are constantly in want of work, for departmentalism has no need of their services. Indian art cries out for bread; we give it museums, exhibitions, and archaeology.

The departmental plea of economy will not bear a moment's careful examination. Departmental economy at best is the economy of the limited liability company which keeps up an appearance of prosperity by paying dividends out of capital; for the imitation of a dead classicism which we hold up to the natives of India as the best product of Western civilisation is sapping the foundations of Indian art in the same way as it has destroyed the national art of Europe. In so doing we recklessly use up a part of the resources of our Indian Empire, infinitely more valuable than all its gold mines or coal mines—

resources which, properly utilised, might bring to the revenues of the country as much as any department of the State. Anglo-Indian architectural works are rarely even relatively economical; for the native builders under our inartistic system are rapidly losing the sentiment of good craftsmanship, which always accompanies the artistic sentiment. In the same way the decay of national sentiment in European art has produced the modern school of jerry-builders. The process of alterations, patchwork, and repairs which Indian public buildings now require, is not entered against the capital account, so that does not trouble the departmental budgets. But when Macaulay's New Zealander, who in some far-off time will continue the *dilettante* propensities of our race, turns his attention from the ruins of London to the sites of great Anglo-Indian cities, he will sketch and wonder what rude barbarians left mud-heaps for memorials among the stately relics of native imperial rule. Swadeshi builds for posterity —we for ourselves. Are we right and all the centuries wrong?

The third vital matter of Indian administration which I have mentioned above is national education. From this, Indian Universities, like their European models, are unanimous in excluding art. It is a common saying that an artist who wishes to know his faults should give his work to be copied by his pupils. Indian Universities, with the unerring shortsightedness of the copyist, have exaggerated the defects of the older English Universities to the point of caricature. The many excellences of English college-culture are too well advertised by its votaries to need mention. Indian Universities have only recognised its faults—the aloofness from the national life and want of breadth. Inversely, Oxford has attempted to reproduce Greek culture by composing Greek odes and essays—ignoring the fact that it was based on the cultivation of the aesthetic faculties and a profound study of human nature—while Japan has caught the true spirit of it in not attempting an imitation.

Lord Curzon has given Indian Universities a new machinery. They have now to work out their own salvation with it, and are apparently about to restore Indian culture on a basis of modern science. The idea that teaching Indian schoolboys a smattering of modern experimental science will be a revelation to a culture and civilisation which constructed a theory of the Universe, based on what we call modern scientific principles, five thousand years ago must make Swadeshi laugh in its sleeves; but the difficulty of applying Western ideas to the East is shown even in metaphors—for Swadeshi generally has no sleeves. The Greeks believed that by teaching their children to love God's beauty in Nature they would help them to bring beauty into their daily lives. They thus found what modern educationists are always looking for—a religion without dogma. Every national art since the world began expresses the same sentiment. In Europe we still believe in beauty to a certain extent, provided that it is

archaeologically correct. In India we only believe in unadulterated ugliness and moral text-books. The Greeks understood that by the study of nature and of art they were developing the powers of observation and the powers of original thought, as art represents the creative faculties developed through the observation of nature. Greek education was, therefore, a system of national culture based on national life and art. The present Indian University system is a system of pedagogics based on narrow utilitarianism.

The artistic sense is the essence of real culture. Homer, Shakespeare, and the Mahâbhârata, products of national life and art, will live when most of our college-made culture is lost in the limbo of time. But art as the vitalising influence in national culture is as little understood by Indian Universities as it is by departmentalism. The art faculty only exists as part of the University machinery. Swadeshi in Bengal has raised a cry for a national University. Though there may be sedition in the cry there is none in the idea itself; it is the ideal for which all Indian educationists must aim. A real national University would solve the greatest difficulty of Indian education—the question of religion. However suitable it may be for the Western social and political system to exclude religion from State education, the idea is and always will be utterly incomprehensible and abhorrent to the East. By transplanting this system to India we make Indian colleges hot-beds of irreligion and disloyalty, and only create a Frankenstein to curse and hate us. Akbar solved the difficulty by inventing a religion for the State, and at the same time allowing all his subjects to practise theirs. We could do the same by founding a Christian University and giving State aid to all other creeds in founding their own. Swadeshi would then be wholly on our side. We should hoist sedition with its own petard and convert an armed camp into a loyal and contented Empire.

It may be that art is merely a matter of sentiment; but sentiment has brought Japan where she is to-day, and if the centuries can be trusted, sentiment rules the world. The bigotry of Aurangzebe destroyed the art of the Moguls and broke up the empire which the sword of Babar and the statesmanship of Akbar founded. Is there not a danger to the Empire which Warren Hastings, Clive, Wellesley, and Dalhousie won for us in the short-sighted departmentalism which crushes out the spirituality of the people? That is not the white man's mission.

E. B. HAVELL.

THE KING OF SIAM AND HIS COUNTRY

THE King of Siam has come to Europe and intends shortly to pay a second visit to England. It is ten years since His Majesty was last here. The first King of Siam of the present dynasty was a successful soldier, who in the eighteenth century repelled a formidable Burmese invasion, and restored his country's freedom and independence after a long and severe struggle. But the ability of various members of the Royal Family of Siam has shown itself quite as conspicuously in peace as in war. One of the King's immediate predecessors was a remarkably successful student in languages ancient and modern, Eastern and Western. Another was a well-known mathematician, and the reigning King has a knowledge of English literature and a conversational fluency in English which astonish most Englishmen who have come in contact with him. The King is widely recognised as the Representative of the purest form of the Buddhist religion in the Far East, a religion which in its moral doctrines and rules of life offers many striking analogies to Christianity. Those admitted to the King's friendship speak with enthusiasm of a personal charm not easy to define, but which has its roots in a rare combination of keen perceptions, subtle humour, wide knowledge, and broad sympathies.

Siam is a country full of interest for those who care to study the Far East; and for Englishmen, more than any other Europeans, there are abundant reasons why such a study has special attractions. From the political, the industrial, and, we may add, the personal side, there are few countries in the world more worth visiting than Siam, and few so seldom visited. Geographically, Siam is off the main track from East to West and from West to East. This is why the stream of tourists and travellers usually pass it by. They are most of them in a hurry to get from the place they are at to the place they are going to, and Siam is not a country to visit in a hurry. Everything there is suggestive of a contemplative rather than a transitive mood.

Before the French annexation of 1893 Siam had an estimated area of about 280,000 square miles, that is more than double the area of Great Britain and Ireland, and although a large slice has been taken off on her eastern and northern boundaries, and, by a recent agreement with France, still more has gone from her Cambodian tributary provinces, there remains a large territory whose frontier 'marches' for hundreds of miles with that under British rule.

The King of Siam was only seventeen years of age when, in 1867, he ascended the throne, and at once he set himself to deal with the difficult and delicate problem of domestic slavery as it then existed in his country. Slavery in Siam had a double origin. In the first place those captured in war were generally made slaves, and their descendants were born in slavery, and, secondly, insolvent debtors often sold themselves and their families to their creditors, and were bound to work for them in a servile condition without pay.

Nothing like African slavery ever existed in Siam. Slaves could never be lawfully treated as mere chattels to be passed from hand to hand outside the protection of the law. Theoretically, at all events, they were under the law, and their masters were liable to punishment for maltreating them. Soon after the present King came to the throne a great reform was introduced. A law was passed providing that, after the date of the King's accession, no one could be born a slave, no matter who his parents were, or what their status was. In the second place, after the same date no one could become a slave either by capture in war or by reason of insolvency, or in any other way. The change was a radical one, affecting property and vested interests, as well as ancient custom, but, partly owing to the wisdom by which the change was not suddenly but gradually made, and still more by reason of the King's personal influence and popularity the new law was accepted, and domestic slavery, as a legal institution, has been gradually disappearing in Siam and is now practically extinct. There is a striking similarity between this gradual and automatic system of abolishing slavery in Siam and the plan adopted by General Gordon many years later in the Soudan in dealing with the slave trade there. But it may safely be said that the young King of Siam followed no precedent, but created one for himself and his Government when he inaugurated his reign by an act of enlightened justice and of generous sympathy towards those of his subjects who were least able to help themselves. From time to time, at long intervals, Siam had sent special embassies to European Powers, but the first permanent minister was accredited in 1883, when the writer of this article undertook the duties of Secretary of Legation for the Siamese Government, and accompanied the Minister (who was related to the King and had received an education in England) on a diplomatic tour to the various capitals of Europe.

One of the objects of this Mission was to persuade European Governments to restore to Siam by treaty arrangements the control over the traffic in alcoholic liquors imported by foreign countries into Siam. This control had been lost because, by earlier treaties between Siam and European Powers, foreign goods were allowed to enter Siam on payment of a nominal duty, and no special clause had been inserted excepting alcohol from this general arrangement. The consequence was that not only European liquor was admitted into

Siam practically as a free import, but also from China an exceptionally strong and poisonous kind of alcoholic drink had found its way into Siam, which was demoralising the people to such an extent that the King and his Government were determined to bring it under effective control. So strong was the feeling aroused that it was generally understood that, rather than see his subjects ruined by what was to them alcoholic poison, the King was determined to cancel every treaty with Europe, and start fair with control over the Siamese liquor traffic as the one essential condition precedent to the negotiation of any new treaty. At this time (1883) Lord Granville was Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice (now Lord Fitzmaurice) was Parliamentary Under Secretary. They gave a sympathetic hearing to the case for Siam, and very shortly a treaty between England and Siam was signed, enabling the Siamese Government to raise the duty on spirits imported from England, and thereby to resume an effective control over the liquor traffic—an example subsequently followed by seven other European Powers.

In some cases the negotiations were prolonged, and were by no means easy to conduct, specially in countries where large revenues were derived from the export trade in liquor, and things were not made more easy when it was found that Siam had nothing to offer in return for the concession she was asking.

Religion, custom and climate are all in combination against the consumption of alcohol in Siam. Whiskey has been called 'civilised water' by the Siamese. Whatever may be the requirements of the 'Pioneers of Civilisation' in Eastern and tropical countries, they had better keep their 'civilised water' for their own consumption, for it spells ruin and death to the native races.

Diplomats who go on a tour from one Government to another asking for justice towards a small country many thousands of miles away find that they are not always reposing on a bed of roses. And when every treaty that is signed is made dependent on every other by the insertion of a 'most favoured nation clause,' the whole of the work may be ruined by one false step, or by the snapping of one link in the chain which is being so carefully forged. But, from the point of view of justice and humanity, the Siamese case was a strong one, and the writer of this paper gratefully records that in all cases, from Sweden in the north to Italy and Spain in the south, friends to Siam were found who warmly sympathised with the aims and objects of the Siamese Mission of 1883 and 1884.

Taxation in Siam

In regard to taxation, the custom practically universal in Eastern countries for levying taxes has been to farm them out to contractors who agree to pay the Government a fixed annual rent, no questions being asked so long as the fixed rent is paid without any violent disturbance

among the taxpayers. The system as described proclaims its inevitable abuses. It invites oppression, makes honesty almost impossible, and the man who practises honesty a ridiculous fool in the eyes of the majority of his neighbours. But the difficulty of changing such a system when it has been ingrained into the history, habits, and political administration of a highly conservative country is enormous. The man whose purse is lightened by any change, administrative or political, however necessary and just, naturally describes the process as a revolution based on confiscation. The system of farming out has not always been confined to the Far East. Our own army used to have its regiments farmed out to colonels, whose income was largely supplemented by whatever they could make out of the necessaries supplied to their men—sometimes, it was said, necessaries that did not exist to men who had no existence except on paper. The Siamese Government, alive to the abuses entailed by the existing system, asked the assistance of Lord Cromer, who recommended the appointment of Mr. Mitchell Innes as Financial Adviser. He began the work which has been continued by his successor, Mr. Rivett Carnac, who served for twenty-five years in the Financial department of the Indian Government, and subsequently by Mr. Williamson, who is still at Bangkok. Mr. Rivett Carnac's budget for 1901–2 was the first ever made public in Siam. The changes which have been begun, and are being carried out, are all in the direction of a more healthy system of finance. Fixed salaries for officials have been introduced, and the farming-out plan is being abolished. The necessary revenue is more and more being taken from the legitimate sources of wealth, the creation of productive industries, and less and less from opium, gambling, and other forms of demoralizing luxury. The decrease of taxes of the one kind has been balanced by an increase of taxes of the better kind. In one year the decrease of revenue from the abolition of gambling houses amounted to nearly 40,000*l*., but, on the other hand, the increased rice tax came up to nearly 44,000*l*.

Owing to natural causes, as well as by reason of financial reforms, public money has found its way in an increasing volume into the public treasury, and the trade of Siam and the general financial prosperity of the country have largely increased in recent years. The total export and import trade of Bangkok in 1904 amounted to more than ten million pounds sterling, and in 1905, according to the last consular report, this record year has been practically equalled, or, eliminating the somewhat uncertain and fluctuating item of 'treasure,' and taking into consideration the values of 'produce and merchandise,' the finances of 1905 compare favourably even with those of 1904. The exports from Siam for 1905 amounted to nearly six millions sterling, 86 per cent. of these exports being sent to British ports. Rice accounts for nearly 77 per cent. of the exports, amounting in value to 4,600,000*l*.,

being an advance in value of no less than 1,227,000*l.* over the average of the five preceding years. Teak valued at 817,400*l.* accounts for 13 per cent. of the total exports. The ports of Singapore and Hong Kong received, or distributed, about 76 per cent. of the export trade of Siam. These figures are quite enough to show how largely interested Great Britain and her colonies are in the industries and prosperity of Siam. It may be added that of the 77,000 tons of teak timber exported from Siam in 1904, 44,000 tons were taken by India, 12,000 by Hong Kong, 3,800 by Singapore, and 1,300 tons by the United Kingdom. It should be remembered that the teak trade is subject to one uncontrollable uncertainty from which many other trades are free. It depends on the rise and volume of the water in the various rivers on which the logs are floated down from the forests to the rafting stations. The output from the forests is dependent on the output from the rivers, a double uncertainty which sometimes baffles calculation and upsets averages in a very unexpected fashion.

Education in Siam has made an immense advance during the present reign. Every year there has been a stream of Siamese students coming to Europe or returning home. The large majority of them come to England, where they are distributed among various schools, a fair proportion being sent to the great public schools, and on to Oxford or Cambridge. The wider curriculum and less severely classical atmosphere of Cambridge offer greater attractions to the Siamese students than Oxford. Several of them have been called to the Bar, and have qualified for other professions, such as the army, the navy, engineering, surgery, and medicine. The Crown Prince of Siam was in England for several years, educated privately. He then passed through Sandhurst, joined an English regiment, and ended his English education by a year at Christ Church, Oxford. He is now acting as Regent during the King's absence. Several of the Crown Prince's brothers have been educated in England, and some have gone from here to Germany, Denmark, and Russia. There is no royal family in the world of which the members have had such varied experience in almost every country in Europe. It is not many years ago that the first Siamese students came to Europe, and now they have been seen, known, and liked at most of our public schools and universities, and in the schools and universities abroad. They have served in our Navy and Army, and worked in our workshops, in our laboratories and in our hospitals. Many of the Siamese students have held their own in the cricket and football field. A son of the King of Siam has often coxed and coached the Cambridge University crew on the Cam, although he did not steer the boat against Oxford. Some have played racquets and tennis for their schools, and have distinguished themselves in fencing and boxing, and other forms of athletics.

Many years ago Mr. Edward Bowen of Harrow said to the writer, 'You are trying an extraordinary experiment in sending young

Siamese to Harrow, and you are wonderfully sanguine in supposing that they can adapt themselves to our public school life.' Shortly before his death he spoke of the extraordinary success they had achieved, and said that there was not a master at Harrow who would not gladly welcome them to his house.

Of the political connection between England and Siam little need be said here. Only one or two of the more recent diplomatic arrangements can be noticed.

For generations past there has been a consensus of opinion practically unanimous among Englishmen who have made a study of politics in the Far East that British interests are intimately concerned in the integrity and independence of Siam. The general tenor of the various treaties which for something like three quarters of a century have governed the relations between the two countries conclusively proves that this is the ruling principle upon which they have been based. A striking confirmation of this principle was given in a practical form by the treaty between England and France of 1896. The two contracting Powers then undertook what amounted to a mutual guarantee against armed intervention in Central Siam.

This international agreement was accompanied and explained by a letter to Lord Dufferin, then British Ambassador in Paris, from Lord Salisbury, which made it absolutely clear that this guarantee of only a part of Siam did not cast any doubt upon the validity of the Siamese title to the remainder of her territory outside the guaranteed portion. In 1904 a declaration was signed by Lord Lansdowne and the French Ambassador containing an express disclaimer by the English and French Governments of all intention to annex any part of Siamese territory. While England has carried out her intention France has not, and large portions of what were tributary Siamese provinces are now included within French dominions.

The very latest treaty between France and Siam has been signed only a few weeks ago, and the terms of it have not yet been published. For the sake of all concerned it is to be hoped that this may be found to contain a settlement which may be final and permanent between the two Governments.

While much has been done during recent years by way of internal reforms, and also to advance the national and the international position of Siam, much more remains to be done. The burden of extra-territorial jurisdiction still hangs heavily round the necks of those who are responsible for her government. Its mischievous effects are by no means confined to the Siamese. If dual government is bad for any country, a plurality of governments is infinitely worse, and the evils of it are borne by all who share in it, even by those who are supposed to benefit by it. Japan has shaken herself clear of it. It will be a good day for Siam when she can do the same. A beginning was made as long ago as 1883 when the British Government,

in what is known as the Chiengmai treaty, gave up, in return for certain advantages, a large portion of her local extra-territorial rights. An international court was established, in which all local cases in which British subjects are parties have been tried under Siamese law. The experiment has been, on the whole, highly successful, and may serve as a precedent for the future.

The time will come, and that shortly, when Siam will ask for an entire revision of the tariffs settled by treaties, some of them more than half a century old. This is necessary, not as a protective measure, but to enable the Government to carry out the administrative reforms which are needed not only for the Siamese themselves, but also for the general prosperity of trade, and of those foreign residents who are engaged in it. A 3 per cent. import duty is hardly better than none at all, and this was the tariff settled in a treaty signed by Sir John Bowring as long ago as 1855, and which has lasted up to the present time.

A Government which has the courage to give up large revenues derived from gambling tables has a strong claim to charge a sufficient import duty for the purposes of efficient administration. For the future what is more wanted than anything else is that Siam should be given the peaceful opportunity to work out her own salvation in enlightened progress, without threats of absorption from outside, or an excess of intervention in her internal affairs. That she will not listen to, and accept, the advice of experts no one will for one moment assert who knows how much the late Monsieur Rolin Jacquemyns was able to effect during his residence at Bangkok, and how many important reforms have been successfully recommended by the experience, ability, and tact of the present Adviser, Mr. Edward H. Strobel, formerly Professor of International Law at Harvard University.

As in the healthiest and most civilised form of every community the highest test of social advance is that the strongest and the weakest members can live side by side, each enjoying the perfect security of laws which are equal for all and effectual for the protection of all alike, so in the commonwealth of nations the highest form of international civilisation is that which recognises and respects the independence of the smaller, just as completely as that of the most powerful countries, and regards with a genuine sympathy every advance towards a higher national life made by a government whose past history, present conditions, and future aims and ambitions may differ widely from those of the great European Powers.

In conclusion we wish good luck to Siam, and offer a cordial welcome to our honoured guest who for forty years has been the King of that country and the best friend to his people that they have ever had.

FREDERICK VERNEY
(Late Councillor of the Siamese Legation).

THE WHITE FLAG' IN JAMAICA

THE publication of the White Paper (or, as it should be called, the 'White Flag') which is said to deal with 'Correspondence relating to the resignation by Sir A. Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica,' has an importance that is of Imperial gravity. The fact that it was issued in the late days of April, and that it is therefore now six weeks old, must not preclude the British public from giving its most serious attention to the manner in which the Colonial Office has seen fit to treat one of the oldest and most faithful of British public servants. The success of our Empire depends, in so far as India and the Crown Colonies are concerned, almost entirely upon the qualities of the members of the Civil Service, and if these Imperial officers, for they are no less, are to be liable to treatment that would not be meted out to the commonest criminal, then it is to be feared that in the future men will hesitate to give their lives or their sons to a service that is exposed to chances such as those which have caused the retirement of Sir Alexander Swettenham.

There is a tendency in high quarters to forget that the Empire belongs not to the Cabinet but to the British nation in the most comprehensive sense of that term; that the making of laws in Parliament belongs to the joint Houses, and not to the Executive of the day; that the Army is not a perquisite of the War Office; that the Colonies are not the peculiar possession of the Secretary of State for the time being; that all these instruments of Imperial power belong, in fact and in truth and in equal degree, to every subject of His Majesty. It is because the Colonial Office does appear to think that the large provinces which it is paid to superintend are in some sort of body-and-soul bondage to the administration of the Colonial Office that it lacks the oversea popularity which it otherwise might enjoy. As with the Colonies, so with the Colonial service; the officials sent out from England to govern at the ends of the world are primarily public servants who, if their superiors betray or forsake them, may claim restitution from the nation for which they have borne the burden and the heat of a lifetime.

The case of Sir Alexander Swettenham is one which calls for examination at the hands of the public. This is felt by every man

who believes in hearing the accused before he is condemned, and who does not allow his conscience to be satisfied by the reading of newspaper reports alone. The expression of this feeling was exhibited by those who moved in the House of Commons for papers dealing with the subject, and who recognised that they must hold their judgment in suspense until official evidence was laid before them. Ultimately the papers were produced, and what did they contain? (1) A newspaper report of Sir A. Swettenham's now notorious letter, and a hectoring addendum from the Colonial Secretary, requiring an apology if the letter were indeed authentic, but not asking for a copy of the document to which it was the answer; (2) Authentic copies of (*a*) the Admiral's note and (*b*) Sir A. Swettenham's reply; (3) A full official apology from the Governor of Jamaica to the American Admiral; and (4) An intimation that he will retire from the public service.[1] And upon this selected evidence alone the Colonial Secretary has the assurance to expect that the people of England will mutely acquiesce in yet another snub to a prominent public servant.

I cannot help believing that a full comprehension of even a few of the circumstances carefully eliminated from the White Paper will show Sir A. Swettenham to have been a far better guardian of British honour than the slightly hysterical and very official individual who has caused the retirement of the Governor. For convenience sake I will tabulate the events as they occurred, with such notes as seem desirable to elucidate the position.

The 14th of January.—The earthquake at Kingston; ruin of the city and deplorable loss of life. The Governor wired to Santiago de Cuba to purchase bandages, &c.

The 15th of January.—Parts of Kingston in flames; news probably reached Havana.

The 16th of January.—At midnight two United States battleships and a cruiser, under command of Rear-Admiral Davies, arrived in Kingston harbour. The officers went immediately on board the *Port Kingston*, escorted thither by the Governor himself, who made it plain that he desired no salute.

The 17th of January.—The United States ships fired a salute; the Admiral landed fifty armed men and working parties; the United States flag was hoisted in a field on British territory and an American hospital was installed.

This done the Admiral writes to the Governor explaining that the visiting navy let off its guns by mistake, and then proceeds to 'propose' and 'judge' and 'direct' concerning the situation, as though there were no such person as a British Governor within a thousand miles.

[1] The reason given, 'on account of age,' is an official and recognised formula; a pension might be withheld from a Civil Servant retiring in a fit of pique but not from one who resigns under medical advice or 'on account of age.'

I landed working parties from both ships to-day [he writes]. *I* propose to land parties to-morrow unless you expressly desire me not to do so. . . . *I* judge the police surveillance of the city is not adequate. . . . *I* shall direct the medical officers of my squadron. . . . *I* trust that you will justify me in the matter. . . .

Later in the day the Admiral wires to his Chief-in-Command at Havana to the effect that

Sir A. Swettenham is a man of great power; declined my offer to land working parties to assist in hospital, to police streets, clear away débris and bury the dead. . . . Later by request [*Query—by whose request?*] I landed fifty men under arms to prevent a mutiny in the penitentiary. .

There was no mutiny; both inside and outside the penitentiary the populace preserved an attitude of admirable composure under the circumstances, so these troops were withdrawn by request of the Governor, who had never authorised their landing,

as he has assured me [continues the Admiral] he is capable of controlling the situation. He has West Indian Regiment 1,000 strong, and two companies of artillery besides insular constabulary. . . . I consider it my duty to remain for the present at least. Situation is too confusing, and conflicting stories, reports, complaints, and rumours too contradictory to enable me at present to form a clear judgment of actual situation.

From this unique document it will be seen that Governor Swettenham's assurances that he was quite able to look after Kingston impressed the Admiral very little; and that the latter was quite prepared to take yet another island in the Caribbean Sea under the sheltering wing of the American eagle. He felt, however, that he would require justification for his action, and therefore he asked for it in his letter to the Governor. From a communication supplied later by Admiral Evans to the Navy Department we learn that on this date (the 17th of January) Admiral Davies *received a reply of thanks* from the Governor, 'who thinks that he has the situation well in hand.'

The 18th of January.—Lord Elgin telegraphs that he does not desire to fetter the Governor's discretion, &c.

President Roosevelt offers official assistance.

Admiral Davies cables for more dressings for the wounded.

Sir A. Swettenham replies to Admiral Davies's letter.

It must be remembered that the Governor had already courteously thanked the Admiral on the previous day for his assistance, even though he had not invoked it. He also knew that the Admiral entirely mistrusted his reading of the situation, and was becoming a difficult problem in a situation already sufficiently complicated. He never doubted the *bona fides* of the sentence in the Admiral's letter: 'I shall land troops to-morrow *unless you expressly desire me not to do so*,' any more than he questioned the humanity and kindliness of the Admiral's intentions. But he had to get rid of these armed parties of American sailors, whose presence among negroes was both

profoundly unpopular and also a serious danger; moreover he had to prove to a questioning world that Britain can still manage Jamaica without outside help. And so, trying to combine frankness with some jocularity, he wrote the private letter beginning 'Dear Admiral Davies.' I am not concerned to defend the epistolary style of Sir A. Swettenham; possibly his humour was less suited to the occasion than the directness of his request that a foreign force should leave the island. But the public is anxious to know how it is that an obviously private letter found its way into the public Press, and then became incorporated in a Parliamentary paper. Who gave that letter to the pressman who sent it over the wires? My own information from Jamaica, which is accurate though unofficial, goes to show that the name of the individuals concerned are well known in the West Indies, and that the slightest investigation would disclose them. One other point about this letter deserves notice; if it was a private letter, the man who made it public under such circumstances deserves to be ostracised from decent society on both sides of the Atlantic; if it was an official letter, it should have been forwarded in cipher to be dealt with by the Navy Department or the State Secretary at Washington. Of this I am certain; if, believing a document to be an official communication of a very grave nature, any British officer had been responsible for it reaching the Press before it reached the Admiralty, he would have been instantly relieved of his command.

The 19th of January.—Sir Edward Grey telegraphed, by Sir A. Swettenham's desire, his thanks for the prompt and powerful assistance given by Admiral Davies.

Upon this same date (the 19th of January) two other letters were written which the Colonial Office has deemed it prudent not to publish. Mr. Churchill declined, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, to divulge their purport. We are therefore driven for our information to an obscure newspaper called the *Jamaica Gleaner*, which, in a limited edition, published the following correspondence. This edition is not now obtainable in Jamaica.

U.S.S. *Missouri*, Kingston, January 19, 1907.

REAR-ADMIRAL DAVIES, U.S.N.

SIR,—On behalf of the Mayor and Council as well as all the citizens of this stricken city, I desire to express my deep and sincere regret that any unpleasantness should have arisen to cause you to decide to withdraw the valuable assistance which you have voluntarily and so generously been rendering to this country and my unfortunate fellow-citizens.

Whatever may have been the cause which has induced you to decide to withdraw, we deeply regret it, and we do not approve or take any part in it; so we ask you not to withdraw your valuable assistance or take offence at the conduct of one man, if, at a time when, overwrought by responsibility and calamity, he has acted in a manner that he himself will regret on reflection; and in particular, I ask you not to let the sick, wounded and destitute call in vain

for the comfort which until now they have been receiving at your hands, and for which I and they thank and bless you.

I have &c.

C. W. TAIT,
Mayor of Kingston.

In reply to this curious communication the American Admiral wrote as follows :

U.S.S. *Missouri*, Kingston, Ja.

SIR,—Your Honour's communication of this date in the name of yourself and Council, as well as all the citizens of Kingston, is received. I beg that you will understand that I am not withdrawing my Squadron from Kingston by reason of any unpleasantness, any misunderstanding, or any cause of offence. I came here to render first and immediate aid. I could remain only for a few days, and within that time I have done all that lay within my power to do, and all that the representative of His Majesty's Government has required of me. As a foreign naval officer I am bound to respect the wishes and requirements of the supreme authority of this island. I have left an emergency hospital at Winchester Park, in what I believe to be good working order, under the supervision of the American Jesuit Fathers. If I were to remain indefinitely there would, I know, be an abundance of work for me to do, but under the circumstances, having fulfilled the object of my mission, viz. to render first and immediate aid, my duties oblige me to withdraw.

I am particularly anxious to remove the impression that there has been any misunderstanding between myself and the constituted authorities of Jamaica, and sincerely believe that the work of restoration will progress; and I express to you my wish that your city may rise again from its ruins and find its former prosperity. I thank you for your expressions of appreciation of such services as my officers and men have been able to render, and

I have &c.

C. H. DAVIES,
Rear-Admiral Com. Detached Squadron, U.S.A.

So much for the charge against the Governor of discourtesy toward and disagreement with the American Admiral. It is 'blown out of the water' by desire of the Admiral himself, who stipulated that his letter to the Mayor should be published.

The 20th of January.—Sir A. Swettenham telegraphed to the State Department at Washington the expression of his profound gratitude.

The 21st of January.—The Davies-Swettenham letters appeared in the English newspapers, which almost unanimously joined in a prolonged howl of objurgation against our own 'man on the spot.' It was too good an opportunity to be lost; there was no time to ask for explanations; no knowledge of antecedent events; no doubt that President Roosevelt might be very angry indeed. Therefore, to avoid such a calamity as this last, a long line of editors was seen on that fateful Monday morning, each offering the Governor's head on a charger to the uncrowned king. Mr. Haldane followed suit with a telegram to the State Secretary, of whose existence he had no official cognisance; but he, too, must needs offer his oblation, at the public expense.

> Have read in newspaper this morning what purports to be a letter from the Governor of Jamaica. Can only say that on the materials before me, I entertain, as responsible for the troops in the Island, feelings of deep gratitude to American Admiral for generous assistance rendered at a most critical time.
>
> HALDANE,
> Secretary of State for War, London.

He did not wait to communicate his telegram through our Foreign Minister, nor for the Governor to relate the circumstances of the American 'assistance'; no, he must keep in with Washington at all costs.

And even Sir Edward Grey, our own Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was seized with the desire to make official amends to the United States for an insult which was neither offered nor felt. He charged our Chargé d'Affaires at Washington with a message, which was duly delivered, that 'if the [Press] advices are correct, Great Britain will deeply regret that an official should have written such a letter to the gallant Admiral who rendered such valuable assistance' &c.

The 22nd of January.—Lord Elgin presses on, with his premature lecture on deportment to a Colonial Governor of high standing—the one document in the White Paper which is new to the public. It is most remarkable that nobody in our Government dared at the moment to stand up for our representative, not on the question of his manner, but upon the matter of his action. Yet, whilst England was passing through all this twopenny turmoil, the Admiral in question was denying in an interview that there had been any misunderstanding between the Governor and himself, as well he might. The American Press deals with the incident in an unusually reticent fashion, which implies some doubt as to the freedom of their own representative from blame; the Canadians, to a man, applaud one who refuses to countenance the lion's tail-twisting in a distant land; and the *Journal des Débats* writes as follows:

> Is it fair to lodge the whole responsibility with Sir A. Swettenham? It is an international usage never to embark an armed force in a foreign country without being invited to do so by the authorities on land. Now, Admiral Davies acted on his own initiative. He took in hand the policeing of the town without the Governor of Jamaica having requested him to do so.

On the same day we learn that the populace is absolutely quiet, and the military guards are being withdrawn.

The 23rd of January.—Sir A. Swettenham sends copies of Admiral Davies's letter and his own reply, upon which the Colonial Office charge of discourtesy is based.

The 24th of January.—Sir A. Swettenham apologises by order, and tenders his resignation; Washington, which took no umbrage, is prematurely appeased by vicarious sacrifice.

Whilst I am writing of apologies, let me ask two questions which appear to be exceedingly pertinent to the matter in hand. Has the

Foreign Office received any apology from the United States Government for the landing of armed troops upon British territory without the permission of the British Government; and, if not, why not? It is common talk in Washington that an apology for this *excès de zèle*, for it was nothing more formidable than that, would naturally have been forthcoming but for the peculiar haste of Mr. Haldane's telegram. Here we must force ourselves to believe facts more wonderful than fiction: our Secretary for War telegraphs to the State Secretary (the equivalent of our Foreign Minister at home), with whom he has no official intercourse, concerning the affairs of a colony with which officially he has nothing to do, thanking the American Secretary for sending naval troops into an island which was, according to the Governor of that island, sufficiently protected by the West Indian regiment for whose efficiency the Secretary for War was himself responsible!

The second question is: What has Sir A. Swettenham to say concerning the many talks which he had with Admiral Davies, and what arguments has he adduced for finally desiring that officer to remove his armed forces? Be it noted, we are here dealing with a man whose action and whose condemnation is published, but *whose defence is withheld* from the British public which is, or should be, at once his master and his judge. Is this procedure, so absolutely foreign to the tradition of British law, to be the exclusive privilege of the Cabinet when dealing with the Civil servants of the Crown?

I return for a brief moment to my diary, with the observation that, after the Governor's resignation on the 24th of January, the 'incident' seems to have lapsed from the attention of those in high places at Whitehall.

The 12th of February.—The King's Speech, referring to the Jamaican calamity:

> I have seen with satisfaction that the emergency has been met by the Governor and his officers with courage and devotion, and by the people with self-control . . . and I recognise with sincere gratitude the sympathy shown by the people of the United States of America, and the assistance promptly *offered* by their naval authorities.

A change has come over the spirit of the Cabinet dream; the man they had practically expelled from office is recognised by his Sovereign to have acted with courage and devotion, whilst proper thanks are expressed for the American *offer* of assistance. It seems as though a commonsense, not too common in the Cabinet, had returned to the official utterance of a great nation. And what followed? This was not officially known to the public until it was revealed in answer to a question in the House of Commons on the 1st of May. Sir Alexander Swettenham was asked by His Majesty's Government, at whose command he had apologised to a foreign nation, to await the arrival

of despatches from home, and then to say whether he would like to reconsider the question of his resignation. The lack of generosity which forbids the Home Government to *ask* him to withdraw it will be immediately noted. The despatches duly arrived; there was no explanation of the discrepancy between the tone of Lord Elgin's bullying command and the generosity of the phrase in the King's Speech, nor was there any intimation that His Majesty's Secretary for the Colonies had ordered an apology under a misapprehension and was ready to admit the blunder. There is good reason to believe that if the onus of the apology (which, in international affairs, is a grievous one) had been undertaken by Lord Elgin, the resignation would have been withdrawn. But no such justice was exhibited; the Governor was invited to say whether *he* wished to reconsider his resignation; had he done so, it would necessarily have been left to him to explain to the Empire why on earth he apologised to the United States. He was wiser in his generation than His Majesty's Government; he saw that, after having been censured for his action, and having handed in an official apology, his period of usefulness as a British Governor ceased when the dignity of his office lacked the vital support of the Crown. So he persisted in his resignation, and the Empire is the poorer for lack of one of its oldest and most experienced pro-Consuls.

Here, again, in the 'White Flag' paper, we miss any attempt to explain what had occurred between the 22nd of January, when the Governor was ordered to apologise, and the 12th of February, when His Majesty declared himself satisfied with the 'courage and devotion' of his representative in Jamaica. Surely something had transpired of which we are purposely kept in ignorance, in the vapid hope that 'nobody notices what goes on in the Colonies'; or was the procedure adopted in flattery of that vanished hand which penned in 1904 the censure of Sir Frank Younghusband for his conduct of the mission to Lhassa, and trusted to the honied words of Lord Lansdowne in the House of Lords in 1905 to mollify the Imperial spirit of the nation and to pour balm into the personal wound of a public servant?

I pass over many points concerning which a serious study of the events, carefully verified and detailed in the foregoing pages, gives cause for reflection. I leave to those who have the right to demand it the duty of claiming the correspondence which is so impudently absent from the White Paper. It may be said that it would be a delicate matter to publish papers which we know to have passed between Washington and Downing Street; it may be answered that we shall have no Empire to defend if we cannot treat our public servants with ordinary justice. If the British Government wants a Governor of the calibre of which we are proud, it must give him responsibility, permit him to exercise it, and stand by him until 'the benefit of the doubt' is exhausted; it must not censure him in a

despatch without having heard him and then compliment him in a King's Speech; forcing him to retire in January and inviting him to withdraw his resignation in the following month. If the Government wants a gramophone and not a Governor, let it say so; the substitute may be cheaper, but let us ponder well as to which master of correct English is to dictate from Downing Street to the uttermost ends of the Empire; the Natal 'record,' for instance, should not be repeated, nor the language with which several responsible Ministers are accustomed to adorn their speeches.

In view, therefore, of all these circumstances, I hold it to be a public duty to demand that the Government shall present the full story which they owe us, but of which they have only given us a very few intermittent threads. Until this is done, who can believe in all their brave words about solicitude either for the honour of the Colonies or of the Empire as a whole? I do not ask for it out of idle curiosity, for I have a hideous feeling that I know the reason which has caused this Government to turn its back upon our Governor; namely, the hope of favour to come from elsewhere—a hope which its action has condemned to eternal disappointment, since 'the spoils are for the *strong*.' I do not ask for it on behalf of an individual, whom I have never seen and with whom I have never had communication direct or indirect. I ask for it in order that the British sense of justice may be thoroughly satisfied, and that public servants in Sir A. Swettenham's position may for the future be assured that in cases of international difficulty they shall be certain of their Sovereign's approval, if they have upheld the independence of the flag, without a previous passage through the valley of Ministerial humiliation and the shadow of official death. But, if this information for which I plead is to be withheld for ever, I shall feel—and millions with me—that the words of the Toronto newspaper are fully justified:

> Everybody knows which of the two [Swettenham or Davies] will have the blame piled on his shoulders. But, if Swettenham be recalled, he should try to make a *détour* through Canada on his way home, as there are people in this country who would like to have a good look at the last of his kind.

IAN MALCOLM.

THE CAPTURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AT SEA

'As things stand at present,' writes Professor Perels in the last edition of his *Internationale Seerecht*, 'we cannot count on the exemption of private property at sea from capture in the near future. The main factor is that the British Government since the Declaration of Paris has maintained an attitude of persistent and determined resistance to all movements for reforming the laws of maritime warfare.' Publicists of almost all countries, including our own, have been expressing themselves in similar terms, and we are warned by some of our best international lawyers that there is growing up abroad a mass of hostile opinion on the subject which it is unsafe for us to ignore. Professor Perels' words conveniently focus for us that alleged mass of opinion, and since he was formerly Admiralitätsrath and is now Departements Direktor in Reichs-Marine Amt and Professor in the Berlin University, we may take his formula as something like our official arraignment at the bar of Europe. But before examining the charge with a view to preparing a defence it is wise at once to enter a claim to vary the indictment. We do not deny the 'persistent and determined resistance.' We merely beg to submit that our 'persistent and determined resistance' has been 'to all movements for reforming the laws of maritime warfare *in the interests of the great military States*.'

It is true that some of our most respected authorities would persuade us that the exemption of private property at sea from capture is particularly to our own interests, because we possess the largest, and therefore, as they assume, the most vulnerable mercantile marine, and because we rely for our sustenance more than any other nation on seaborne supplies. But this is a military question, on which our publicists are not safe guides. It involves strategical considerations, which clearly they have not taken into account, and their view is not shared by the Navy. It is a view, however, which is seriously urged by serious people, and we must return to it. For the present it is enough to claim that the leading facts in the history of the movement create a *prima facie* case that exemption is for the benefit of weak fleets and powerful armies. Started originally by a French abbé,

the idea was first embodied in a treaty by Frederick the Great, a man who had had practical experience of how gravely the vulnerability of commerce at sea may affect the progress of a Continental war. When he was in alliance with Great Britain it did not occur to him to make the suggestion. It was the newborn Republic of America that proposed it to him; and he wisely agreed, since the arrangement made it impossible for the United States ever to make war on him at all. Similarly, the United States was wise to get the sanction of so great a figure to the principle of immunity, since her budding commerce was always at the mercy of her one enemy so long as capture was permitted. With material advantages so great and obvious in hand it can convince nobody to talk of lofty and disinterested ideals.

Next it was Napoleon who put forward the new doctrine, and sought to establish it by the revolutionary violence of his 'Continental System.' In 1866, Austria, cooped up in the head of the Adriatic by the menace of a superior Italian fleet, declared for it. Italy, similarly threatened by France, had already done so. Again, in 1870 Prussia magnanimously intimated that, true to the sublime principles of Frederick the Great, it was her intention, whatever France did, to treat as sacred all innocent private property at sea.

When the buffalo found the lion in his path, he exclaimed, with a superb gesture, 'For my part, I mean to remain true to my vegetarian principles.'

Now to examine the charge more seriously and with what temper we can. For it must be understood that our friends abroad make their accusation opprobriously. We are represented as standing in the way of human progress, of obstructing for our own selfish ends the march of civilisation, of seeking to perpetuate the methods of barbarism, of thwarting the disinterested aspirations of nobler nations to mitigate the severity of war and humanise its practice. And all this because, as they say, we refuse to complete the work of the Declaration of Paris by consenting to give to private property at sea that complete sanctity which it is unblushingly alleged to enjoy in warfare on land. So shocking does such depravity sound that in many cases our serious and high-minded journalism, which is so dear to us, is beginning to ask, in its most moving and conscientious tones, if we are to be the last of all nations to recognise this sacred duty to humanity.

Were it not that this particular attitude towards the question was so ludicrous it would be difficult to treat it with patience. Such a charge against ourselves is peculiarly hard, seeing that we have to our credit a record in respect of the mitigation of war which no nation can pretend to rival. There is no nation that can point to such a concession to the public opinion of the world against interest as we made in consenting, in 1856, to the doctrine of 'Free ships, free goods.' At the time it was widely regarded, and is still so regarded, as depriving us of one of the most powerful weapons in our armoury;

and yet for the sake of goodwill amongst nations, for the sake of softening the hardships of war to neutrals, we surrendered that right. For centuries we had clung to it as essential to the maintenance of our sea power; yet a higher and more farsighted wisdom pressed for the almost quixotic sacrifice, and it was done. Can any nation show a sacrifice beside it? Let him who can cast the first stone at us now.

To add to the unreasonableness of our accusers, instead of acknowledging handsomely the lengths to which we went on that occasion, they rail at us because we will not extend the principle to the complete immunity of private property at sea. As though the one principle had anything to do with the other. 'You might as well say,' said Sir William Harcourt during a debate on the point in 1878—and surely he, whether as a Liberal humanitarian or an international lawyer, should carry weight enough—'You might as well say that the extension of the Great Western Railway would be an extension of the Great Northern. They do not go in the same direction, they have not the same object, they are not parallel in any respect.' Nothing can serve better for clearing the subject of fallacies and exhibiting the true grounds of the British attitude than to follow out the line of reasoning which the great international jurist indicated in opposing the idea on that occasion.

If the ideas which determined the status of private property in war be traced back to the dawn of modern international law, we shall find Grotius, in 1625, and Bynkershoek a century later, giving as an axiom the right to confiscate or destroy all property whatsoever belonging to an enemy wherever found. The axiom was quickly modified by Vattel, who wrote during the Seven Years' War. While admitting the abstract right, he maintained that its exercise should only be permitted as far as it is called for by the purposes of war. Here we have the first application of the true theory of war to the question. We make war not for the purpose of doing the enemy all the harm we can, but to bring such pressure to bear upon him as will force him to do our will—that is, will convince him that to make peace on our terms is better than continuing to fight. Now, the indiscriminate plunder of private property and its wanton destruction, while causing an immense amount of individual suffering, do not contribute in the most forcible way to the kind of pressure that is needed. Consequently, it had already become the practice for an invading enemy to treat private property with a certain respect, or rather, perhaps, economy, and to endeavour to set some restraint upon its indiscriminate plunder and destruction.

It is to this movement is due the oft-repeated but wholly unfounded assertion that private property ashore, unlike private property at sea, has been made generally immune from capture. It is further asserted that this immunity was due to a growing sense of humanity and a Christian desire to mitigate the horrors of war. Now, this is the kind of

assertion which makes plain and practical people impatient with international law and blinds them to its value and reality. It is just one of those expressions which jurists let slip from a mere habit of the pen. Of this particular statement, that the restrictions in question were due to a growing sense of humanity, there is no real evidence whatever. Humanity may have been a contributory cause, but, if we turn from the loose expressions of jurists to the dry light of the orders actually promulgated by invading generals, we see at once that the real reason of the restrictions was strategical and military, and not moral at all. Take, for instance, the earliest case as typical—the rule of Gustavus Adolphus against plundering: 'If it so please God that we beat the enemy either in the field or in his leaguer, then shall every man follow the chase of the enemies; and no man give himself up to fall upon the pillage so long as it is possible to follow the enemy,' etc. This germ idea that pillage actually lessens your power to exert the necessary pressure was further developed by the rules of Frederick the Great; but he took a long step further. For that great master of war recognised not only that pillage demoralised and weakened the weapon with which the pressure had to be exerted, but that pillage and destruction were not the most profitable or effective ways of exercising your rights over the enemy's property. To deprive the enemy's people of their power to produce was both to destroy the value of your conquest and its power of maintaining your troops. To protect the goose and enable her to continue laying her golden eggs was the only sound policy. He therefore insisted on the method of exercising his war right by levying contributions and making requisitions. By this means he at once maintained the temper of his weapon and made the pressure of the occupation more lasting, more powerful, and more directly coercive to the collective life of the enemy. To say that he abandoned his right over enemy's property is to play with words. 'If an army is in winter quarters in an enemy's country,' he writes in his *General Principles of War*, 'the soldiers receive gratis bread, meat, and beer, which are furnished by the country.' And again: 'The enemy's country is bound to supply horses for the artillery, munitions of war, and provisions, and to make up any deficiencies of money.' The truth is that no restraint of the old rule of Grotius and Bynkershoek is to be found that does not operate to the military or strategical benefit of the belligerent, not one that does not directly increase the pressure which the invading force is seeking to exert to achieve its end. The principle reached its clearest expression during the Franco-German war, where it was absolutely essential to German success that they should not goad the French people into guerilla warfare, as Napoleon had done in Spain, by permitting irresponsible exercise of belligerent rights over private property. By the German orders of 1870 no requisition could be made except by general officers or officers in command of detached corps.

The system worked admirably, and, on the whole, as mercifully and with as little individual suffering as is possible in war. The object of an invasion—the means by which it exerts the necessary pressure—is to produce a stagnation of national life. This the German invasion did effectively, and the stagnation grew deeper and more intolerable the more it was prolonged, till submission was recognised to be the lesser evil. But all this was not done merely by the victories of armies. It was done by the exercise of belligerent rights over enemy's property: of the right to seize and consume it; of the right to control roads and railways and inland waters, so as to prevent its flow and render commerce impossible except in so far as it suited the belligerent; and of the right to carry military execution against it in case of resistance by its owners. Without the right to requisitions and contributions, without the right to control civil communications, it could not be done. War, as is universally admitted, would become impossible. Nations cannot be brought to their knees by the mere conflict of armies, any more than they can by the single combats of kings. It is what follows victory that counts—the choking of the national life by process of execution on property, the stagnation produced by the stoppage of civil communications, whether public or private.

Here is a picture of what the process meant, drawn by the able pen of a man who saw it face to face in 1870:

> In occupied towns officials receive no salaries, professional men no fees. The law courts are closed. Holders of house property can get no rent. Holders of land can neither get rent, nor can they cultivate the soil or sell their crops. The State funds pay no dividends, or, if they do, all communication between occupied and unoccupied districts being broken off, the dividends cannot be touched. Railway dividends are equally intangible, and perhaps the line on which the shareholder has especially counted is in the hands of the enemy.

This is what conquest of territory means—the prostration of the national life; and this is why conquest of territory is the means by which land warfare seeks to gain its end.

With this picture in our minds of the way in which private property is dealt with ashore, and the way in which it is made to contribute to the victor's object, let us turn to the sea, and inquire in what manner its treatment there is less moral, less human, or less necessary, if war is to be waged at all. To begin with, we note that in some respects private property has never been so badly treated at sea as it has been on land; at least, in modern times and in regular warfare it has never been the subject of indiscriminate plunder. The ruthless scramble for loot, which led to the acutest suffering and cruelty ashore, was no part of sea capture. Prizes were taken by orderly act of war, were regularly condemned, and the proceeds divided amongst the captors in cool blood and by authority. Again, at sea immediate military execution was never the penalty for resisting interference

with private property, as it always was, and in some cases still is, ashore. The real reason why capture at sea got a bad name was due to privateers, by whom the greater part of it was done, and who in some areas, and particularly in the Mediterranean, were often guilty of unspeakable horrors. The evil was early recognised by Great Britain, and during the Seven Years' War an Act was passed forbidding the granting of commissions to vessels under a certain tonnage, in order to ensure that the work should be done by respectable merchant captains, and not by mere smugglers and pirates. It is not, of course, pretended that this law was made from merely philanthropic reasons, any more than was our concession about 'free ships, free goods.' Though a sense of honour did enter into it, the chief reason was that we found ourselves unable to control the lawlessness of small privateers, and felt that neutrals, whom we did not wish to exasperate, had a legitimate cause of complaint. Now the abuse is no longer possible, since the Declaration of Paris abolished privateering. Over and above this great mitigation of the hardships of warfare against private property at sea, there must also be taken into consideration the spread of the practice of marine insurance, which now distributes the initial loss by individuals over the general capital of the nation. The result is that even the most convinced advocates of the change, both at home and abroad, admit that the argument from inhumanity is untenable. The Lord Chancellor, himself our strongest advocate of reform, has plainly declared that 'no operation of war inflicts less suffering than the capture of unarmed vessels at sea.'

The truth is that the sea service, in demanding the retention of its right to general capture, asks no more than what is universally granted to the land service. It asks no more than to exercise war rights over property in so far as, in the words of Vattel, it is called for by the purposes of war—in so far as the pressure necessary to bring peace cannot be exerted without it. It asks only to be allowed to produce that stagnation of the enemy's life at sea which an army is permitted to produce ashore by conquest of territory. And how can such stagnation be produced? Not by conquest, for conquest of the sea is impossible. The sea cannot be the subject of ownership. You cannot do more, however complete your ascendency, than deprive your enemy of his use of the sea; you can do no more than deny him that part of his national life which moves and has its being on the sea. This is what we mean when we speak of 'command of the sea,' and not 'conquest of the sea.' The value of the sea internationally is as a means of communication between States and parts of States, and the use and enjoyment of these communications is the actual life of a nation at sea. The sea can be nothing else, except a fishing-ground, and fishing is comparatively so small a factor in war nowadays that it may be eliminated from the question. All, then,

that we can possibly gain from our enemy upon the sea is to deny him its use and enjoyment as a means of communication. Command of the sea means nothing more nor less than control of communications. It occupies exactly the same place and discharges the same function in maritime warfare that conquest and occupation of territory does in land warfare. If one is lawful and necessary, so is the other; if both are lawful and necessary, then each connotes the legality and necessity of the means by which alone the condition of stagnation can be brought about.

At sea this condition is produced by dealing with private property on exactly the same principle as on land—that is to say, in the most economical and effective manner. By its capture and conversion to the use of the navy we make it contribute directly to the force and economy of our weapon, and by an orderly system of prize regulations we do it without in any way demoralising our *personnel* or goading the enemy's people to irregular retaliation. By no other means can we do what ashore is done by contributions and requisitions—that is, by no other means can we make enemy's property serve to a merciful and speedy end to hostilities. By this means also we control the enemy's communications, we paralyse his sea-borne commerce, we sever him from his outlying territory. By no other means can we mercifully and effectively deprive him of all the sea can give him, and produce the state of stagnation of his maritime life that conquest of territory does of his life ashore. By the victories of fleets alone it can no more be done than by the victories of armies.

If, then, in this way we test the doctrine of immunity of private property in the cold light of the theory of war—if we keep in mind that war consists of two phases—firstly, the destruction of the enemy's armed forces, and, secondly, of pressure on the population to produce stagnation of national life, we see the answer to our great military neighbours is complete. When they ask us to abandon the right of capture of private property at sea—of dealing with it, that is, in the most merciful and effective way for achieving the purposes of war—we reply, We will do so when you abandon the right of requisition and contribution. And when they ask us, as in effect they do, to give up the right of controlling sea communications, we reply, We will do so when you give up the right to control roads, railways, and inland waters. If they go further—as they fairly may—and ask, 'What about the hardship of detaining the crews of captured merchantmen?' we answer, 'We will abandon that means of stopping your commerce also, when you abandon forced labour of the civil population ashore.' It is all a *reductio ad absurdum*. Without the exercise of such rights both conquest of territory and command of the sea become nugatory and war impossible.

But our opponents may reply, We do not ask you to give up control

of communications. We would leave you commercial blockade. But is this what they mean? It is true that many of them except commercial blockade from their claim, but what the Lord Chancellor demands is entire exemption of private property, 'unless really contraband or its place of destination be a beleaguered fortress.' This, of course, amounts to a complete prohibition of our right to control communications except for the purpose of destroying the enemy's armed forces. It prohibits it for the purpose of the secondary process of pressure, and is entirely inadmissible. The Chancellor's meaning is at least perfectly clear. What is difficult to believe is that those who express themselves less roundly can really mean anything else. Let us examine what the position of these men leads to. In effect they say, We admit your abstract right to capture private property at sea, but deny that its general capture on the high seas is necessary for the purposes of war. This point of view is so plausible that it has highly commended itself to our own advocates of immunity. Ignoring the whole theory of maritime warfare, that it is a mere question of controlling communications, they argue as though all we could gain from general capture on the high seas is the paltry value of the goods seized. It was just Lord Granville's attitude at the momentous meeting of the Secret Committee of the Council on the eve of the Seven Years' War, when, on the question of whether admirals at sea should be ordered to seize French merchantmen, he declared he was against 'vexing your neighbours for a little muck.' If we regard the mere value of the property captured, this is true enough. It represents no more than the captor's attempt to subsist his fleet on the sea he commands, as ashore an army is subsisted on the territory it conquers. But the attempt never leads to much. The best we can do at sea by a complete conversion of all we can lay hands on is but a trifle compared with what is gained ashore by the process of contribution, requisition and forced labour. It is, indeed, not a little hard that the military Powers should scold us for nibbling this sorry crust when they habitually gorge themselves on baskets of loaves.

But though intrinsically the capture of property on the high seas has an almost negligible military value, as a deterrent its value is beyond measure. For it is an essential part of the process of destroying the enemy's commerce by control of sea communication. Blockade alone—even if blockade in the old sense were still possible—will not do. In their best days blockades were never thoroughly effective. It is the feeling that a ship and her cargo are never safe from capture from port to port that is the real deterrent, which breaks the heart of merchants and kills their enterprise. But this is a point on which all may not agree. It matters little, for it is not the one that is fatal to our reformers' claim.

The fatal point is this—that if you admit the only form of blockade

that is possible under present conditions, and refuse the right of general capture, you establish a law so unfairly advantageous to Great Britain that no other Power could possibly be expected to assent to it, and we ourselves would certainly not have the effrontery to propose it.

The current conception of effective blockade is that agreed upon between England and Russia in 1801: the port blockaded must be watched by ships anchored before it or stationed sufficiently near to make egress or ingress obviously dangerous. All countries have adopted this idea. But this was before the days of torpedoes. The idea was, as actually expressed in certain Dutch treaties, that the blockading ships should be as close in as was compatible with safety from the enemy's coast defence. The defence in those days was guns. But what now of mobile defence? Is a blockading fleet entitled to be so far out as to be beyond torpedo-boat or destroyer range? If so it must be completely out of sight, and egress and ingress cannot be manifestly dangerous, and the blockading squadron must be cruising far from the port and far from territorial waters. If such distant and invisible blockade is not to be recognised as effective, then effective blockade is now impossible, and no means of controlling sea communications remains except general capture. It follows, then, that if the Continental Powers admit our right to control communication and deny us general capture, they must recognise such distant blockade as effective and lawful.

Now let us see how the law would work. In the case of war with France (which, being the most unlikely one, may be taken with least offence), it would be admissible for us to station a squadron, say, off Yarmouth and stretch a chain of cruisers from the Lizard to Cape Ortegal, and declare a blockade of the whole of the French Atlantic and Channel ports. Then, after due notice, every neutral and every Frenchman leaving a French port or consigned to one that appeared on the scene would be liable to be captured and sent in for judgment for attempted breach of blockade. The same liability, moreover, by the law of ultimate destination, would attach to such ships *in transitu* in any part of the world. In the case of Russia or Germany a similar situation could be set up still more easily, assuming we had once obtained a working command of the sea. On the other hand, it would be practically impossible for all these three Powers combined to set up such a situation against us; unless, indeed, in the unimaginable eventuality of their being relatively strong enough to maintain a blockading chain from Finisterre through the Faroes to the coast of Norway. It is a pure question of geography. If, then, the doctrine of permitting blockade in its sole possible form and refusing general capture were adopted, we could always paralyse the ocean-borne commerce of any of the great military Powers, while they, being unable to blockade effectively, and not being allowed to make prizes on the high seas, could not possibly touch ours. It is not

to be believed that your well-meaning advocates of justice between nations can really intend an arrangement so grossly unjust. Clearly there is but one alternative—either you must leave the law as it is, or adopt the candid proposal of the Chancellor and abolish capture of private property altogether, saving only contraband and military blockade. And what the Chancellor's proposal would mean must be kept clearly in mind. It would permit us to deal with private property for the purpose of overpowering the armed force of the enemy, and deny us the right to use it for reaping the fruit of success.

Turning now from the Continental Powers to America, we find that the best naval opinion there is entirely with us. The contention on which we rely is really this—that the right to capture merchantmen and their cargoes does not depend on the primitive right over enemy's property so much as on the right and necessity of controlling our enemy's communications. Let us see how it is treated by Captain Mahan, who, above all men, by his genius and learning is entitled to give judgment. His declaration is the more remarkable because America has always been the most prominent champion of immunity and the most ardently convinced that in advocating the reform she was upholding the cause of civilisation, humanity, and justice. This belief with the mass of the people has survived her taking rank as a great naval Power, and must be treated with respect. For all their practical plain sense the Americans are idealists at heart, more so, perhaps, than any other people, and it therefore required no little courage and the deepest conviction for Captain Mahan to stand up and tell his countrymen their feeling of magnanimity was false, mistaken, and contrary to plain sense and justice. Yet so he does in his latest work *The War of 1812*, calmly, cogently, and without flinching. In that work he discloses a ripe study of the theory of war which none of his others contain in the same degree—and for the full development of that theory, be it remembered, we are indebted mainly to the Germans themselves—and here is the result of its application to the question before us:

> The claim for private property [he says] . . . involves a play upon words, to the confusion of ideas, which from that time [that is, from Napoleon's Continental System] to this has vitiated the arguments upon which have been based a prominent feature of American policy. Private property at a standstill . . . is the unproductive money in a stocking hid in a closet. Property belonging to private individuals, but embarked in the process of transportation and exchange, which we call commerce, is like money in circulation. It is the life-blood of national prosperity, on which war depends, and as such is national in its employment, and only in ownership private. To stop such circulation is to sap national prosperity, and to sap prosperity, on which war depends for its energy, is a measure as truly military as is killing of the men whose arms maintain war in the field. Prohibition of commerce is enforced at will when an enemy's army holds a territory. If permitted it inures to the benefit of the conqueror. . . . It will not be doubted that, should a prohibition on shore be disregarded, the offending property would be seized as punishment. . . . The

seizure of enemy's merchant ships and goods for violating the prohibition against their engaging in commerce is what is commonly called the seizure of private property. Under the methods of the last two centuries it has been in administration a process as regular legally as is libelling a ship for an action in damages; nor does it differ from it in principle. The point at issue is not 'Is the property private?' but 'Is the method conducive to the purposes of war?' Property strictly private on board ship, but not in process of circulation, is for this reason never touched, and to do so is considered as disgraceful as a common theft.

He then proceeds to justify on these grounds the consistent attitude of the British Government, and to remind his countrymen that, had their ideas prevailed in 1861, there could have been no blockade of the Southern coast and the Union could only have been maintained at the cost of hundreds of thousands more lives, if, indeed, it could have been maintained at all.

It is easy, of course, to dismiss Captain Mahan's theory of private property at sea being national in its employment as mere casuistry, but that will not serve. The truth it expresses will remain. We have a moral and indefeasible right at sea as well as on land to prohibit and stop, so far as we can without cruelty or unnecessary hardship, the flow of enemy's commerce, on which her resources for war depend as truly as they do upon armies and fleets. If private men in the face of this admitted right choose to ignore the state of war and still embark their property in commerce, they do so with their eyes open and must not complain of the consequences. Let them keep their property quiet at home and it will not be touched—at least by the sea service.

There still remains to be dealt with the argument upon which our own idealists chiefly rely. It is an argument to which allusion has been made already, but has nothing to do with morality, justice, or humanity. For though it is obvious between the lines that our advocates of reform are as sincerely moved as the Americans by an ideal of Christian progress, Briton-like they do not talk about it. With us such things are felt, not spoken. We prefer to offer material, selfish reasons for the faith that is in us, and consequently our idealists argue that the recognition of the sanctity of private property at sea would be a distinct military advantage to ourselves, and, moreover, as is also usual in such cases, that if we do not seize the opportunity to recognise it now it will not occur again. 'I trust,' says the Lord Chancellor, referring to President Roosevelt's proposal to have the thing settled at the coming Hague Conference:

> 'I trust that his Majesty's Government will avail themselves of this unique opportunity. [How familiar is the phrase!] I urge it not upon any ground of sentiment or humanity (indeed, no operation of war inflicts less suffering than the capture of unarmed vessels at sea), but upon the ground that on the balance of argument, coolly weighed, the interests of Great Britain will gain much from a change long and eagerly desired by the great majority of other Powers.

So, then, it is for military reasons that we are to consent to have

the teeth pulled upon which we have relied for so many generations, and to 'abandon in great measure,' as Captain Mahan has put our case, 'the control of the sea, so far as useful to war.' Let us, then, frankly examine these military reasons which the Lord Chancellor sets forth for they are not at once convincing. Indeed, it is obvious that the Lord Chancellor has not brought to bear upon the subject the profound study of war with which his great predecessor, Lord Hardwicke enlightened our councils during the Seven Years' War. We might even beg seriously that before he gives the weight of his high reputation and exalted office any further to the movement he would read and re-read that masterly series of letters which the greatest of the Chancellors addressed to the Duke of Newcastle and others during the most successful war we ever waged.

The main military or strategical argument that is urged is that, as we have the greatest amount of private property afloat, and rely more than anyone upon commerce for our resources, we stand to lose most by the maintenance of the existing law. 'Our merchant marine,' says the Chancellor, 'is vulnerable in proportion to its size and ubiquity.' This is a tremendous assumption, natural enough to one who has made no study of the realities of war; but we may venture to assert that it is one which our naval staff would certainly hesitate to endorse. To point out its fallacy completely would require a whole excursus on the British ideas of commerce protection, and possibly the disclosure of matters which the Admiralty had better keep to itself. But plain sense will suggest difficulties in accepting this very common view. Everyone must know that a cruiser's capacity for destroying commerce is not unlimited. How very limited it is the Chancellor clearly has not well considered. A cruiser can scarcely take more than one ship at once, and to overhaul and ascertain the nationality of a ship takes time. She cannot, moreover, be in two places at once, and the sea is wide. To reach a station where she may safely begin her operations (unless we have entirely lost command of the sea) she will burn coal—she will want plenty to get back again; the time, consequently, during which she can pursue her depredations is very limited indeed. These simple matters, so real to naval officers, are usually ignored by civilians. The broad truth is that if we look at the matter from the point of view of practical warfare, and not pure mathematics, we shall see that there is at least a case for the opposite of the Chancellor's postulate. The greater the bulk of commerce, the more difficult does it become to make any serious impression upon it. The greater the bulk, the larger will be the percentage that is beyond the utmost predatory capacity of the enemy's fleet. Thus it is at least arguable that the invulnerability of the mass of sea-borne commerce increases with its bulk and ubiquity. To carry the matter further is impossible in this place. It must suffice to have pointed out that the Chancellor's postulate cannot be swallowed

whole until it has been well seethed in salt water. In the process it might entirely change colour.

Take, again, another similar argument. 'The principal necessities of England's Navy,' writes Professor Sheldon Amos, 'are to protect her commerce, defend her coasts, and overpower the enemy: it is obvious if the Navy could be relieved of any one of these functions, so much the more disposable it would be for the efficient discharge of the other two.' Here, of course, we are even further from salt water than with the Chancellor; but the passage, teeming as it does with error, has been seriously quoted abroad. How do the Professor and those who complacently cite him imagine that we can defend our coasts without defending our trade, or do either without overpowering the enemy? It is all one—all a matter of getting control of the common communications. Unless and until we do that we have not overpowered the enemy, and we have not gone the best way about defending our coasts and commerce. Casual cruising against our commerce we can ignore, if necessary, in the process of getting control, so small nowadays is the reach and capacity of cruisers and so great the bulk of our commerce. As for serious fleet attacks upon it, we can desire nothing better. It is all very well to talk of overpowering the enemy, of seeking out the enemy's fleet and destroying him, but for this he must let you get at him. That was always our great difficulty; and there is no means so good for making him expose himself as attacking his commerce with your fleet and tempting him to attack yours with his. If our commerce were made as sacred from capture as an ambassador it would give little or no relief to our battle fleets, while, on the other hand, if we were denied the right to attack enemy's commerce we should lose the one sure and rapid means of forcing his battle fleet to a decision.

This brings us to the final part of the argument. It is freely contended that while the immunity of sea-borne commerce would greatly relieve the strain of defence, it would scarcely affect our power of attack. The grinding power of offence which we exercised by attack on commerce in the old wars is recognised, or not denied. But it is asserted that since Napoleonic times, when these wars came to an end, the conditions have entirely changed. The change has taken place in two ways. Firstly, by the Declaration of Paris we are no longer able by general capture to prevent the enemy's commerce being carried in neutral ships; and, secondly, it is contended that the vast development of inland communications has made Continental nations practically independent of seaborne trade—that is, in so far as exerting pressure to compel peace is concerned. Here again we have two of those breezy generalisations which trip so gaily from the pens of international jurists, as though they were not laden and tangled with a nexus of practical considerations, complex and indeterminate to the last degree, and entirely beyond even approximate

measurement. They seem airily to neglect the fact that the capacity of neutral shipping and of inland communications is not unlimited, and to ignore the well-known difficulty of forcing trade to flow healthily out of the channels into which it has settled itself. Neutral ships are always fairly well full of their own business, and if you suddenly throw upon them the extra work of even one considerable mercantile marine, they will either be unequal to the task or freights must leap up to a seriously disturbing degree. The case of railways and inland navigation is treated with even a less appreciation of what actually happens in war. The capacity of railways is even less elastic than that of neutral ships. In peace time their carrying capacity, for plain reasons of business, is seldom much beyond the traffic which accrues in supplying the actual necessities of the nation, and to calculate that with the intolerable extra strain that is always thrown upon them by the paramount exigencies of a great war they would still be able to deal with an equivalent of the normal seaborne traffic is simply to ignore universal experience and the elementary facts of commerce. Even were it possible in any reasonable time to get land communications to bear all their ordinary peace traffic as well as the war traffic, and that of the paralysed mercantile marine, the dislocation of national life and action must at least produce so great a shock to trade, industry, and, above all, credit as to be a strategical blow of the highest order. It is at least a possibility of drastic offence that we, who are so weak, and must always be so weak in the means open to the great military Powers, cannot afford to forgo.

I know it is argued by some of our most respected and earnest journals that our position and the peace of the world would gain a real solidity by the sacrifice, and a real motive for the growth of armaments would be removed, because we should thereby demonstrate that our Navy is meant only for defence. But that is a point incapable of demonstration, simply because it is not true. Our Navy is under certain circumstances intended for offence. Such circumstances, happily, are remote, but it is sheer fatuity to think they cannot possibly arise. Not only is no real and crushing defence possible without attack, but in cases where we are the injured party and no redress can be had except by war, then direct offence is necessary. It is a distasteful subject, above all to the higher Liberalism, where the desire to unarm is keenest. But it has to be faced, and must be faced without false sentiment, as Sir William Harcourt faced it in the great debate already cited:

> There is only one security [he said] for a great naval Power: as far as you can and as soon as you can to sweep the enemy from the seas. Not only must we preserve our right to fight against the navy of our enemy, but to capture all the ships it possesses and all the means it possesses by which we may be attacked. It is the legitimate arm of this great Empire—the arm by which we defend our extended Empire. I go a great deal farther. There is no security in war unless we are strong for offence as well as defence.

It is true. We cannot make ourselves stronger for defence or for doing our part in preserving the peace of the world by casting away our most trenchant and well-proved weapon. It was not the custom at King Arthur's Court for his knights to equip themselves for their holy quests by discarding their spears and trusting to shield and dagger.

In conclusion, it is necessary to enter a protest against one other argument, which is too often advanced by the advocates of immunity, and particularly from commercial centres. Failing to see they have involved themselves in a question which is mainly one of strategy and war-plans, and unable to grasp the force of the naval objection, they do not scruple to suggest that the opposition of naval officers arises from their desire for prize-money. It is to be hoped they scarcely grasp how wanton an insult they offer to a great and honourable Service and how deeply the suspicion is resented. No one in touch with the ungrudging devotion of the modern naval officer could believe for one moment that he would permit so sordid a consideration even to colour the advice he gave his country on so high a matter. It is intolerable the slander should be repeated as often as it has been. Prize-money has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Many officers indeed are of opinion that for the good of the Service alone the system should be abolished. There might be cases in time of war, as there were in days gone by, when prize-money might warp a man's sense of duty. Therefore, they say, let it go—to whom you will. What is good for the Service is good enough for us. Chambers of commerce may find difficulty in appreciating the depth and reality of the sentiment. Could they but do so they would never permit the prize-money argument to sully their petitions again. The reason why naval officers urge with heart and soul the retention of the old right of capture is because they know not how to make war without it, nor can any man tell them.

JULIAN S. CORBETT.

THE CHURCH DIFFICULTIES IN FRANCE FROM A FRENCH POINT OF VIEW

THE object of this article is to present, as far as possible, the present ecclesiastical situation in France as it is seen, known, and realised by French Catholics, who regret, and resent even, the misleading character and colour of the information of correspondents who influence English public opinion through the Press in an anti-papal and more or less pro-governmental spirit and purpose. Obviously it is not only fair, but desirable that all sides in a great contest should be heard and realised; and therefore we have no quarrel with honest statements, ungarbled and unarranged, which represent the side, opinions, and acts of the present anti-Christian Government in France; nor, again, of discontented Catholics, whether laymen or clergy; of Protestants such as Sabatier; or schismatics such as Monsieur Durand Morimbeau, *alias* Monsieur Henri des Houx of the *Matin*; or Catholic journalists of the type of Monsieur Cornély of the *Siècle*; all criticism and information given in the open finds its value, its *real* value, sooner or later; but in this controversy our subject of complaint is that, with hardly any exception, such information is not given to the English press in the open, but is sheltered by the double advantage of anonymity and such *noms-de-plume* as 'A French Catholic,' 'A Catholic Priest,' 'A Roman Catholic Correspondent,' 'A Catholic Layman,' 'Another Catholic Layman'; and quotations are made from 'a very distinguished ecclesiastic,' 'a Bishop,' 'a well-known French priest.' It will be seen we are impartial in our stricture, for the articles in the *Times* by 'A Catholic Layman' have our whole sympathy and assent. But in such a contest as the present all who care for truth, and desire justice and the good of Christendom; desire supremely the kingdom of God; must put aside all personal considerations, and do battle openly according to capacity. As to 'our own correspondent,' of whatever newspaper, our complaint does not apply, their names being to be known by whoever so desires. The contributions of 'A French Catholic' in the *Times*, and still more in a Church of England newspaper from the same source directly, or by inspiration, are of a character which justify us in asking the name,

and in reminding the English public that anonymous correspondents should not be given unlimited credence. The articles and letters referred to may, probably do, emanate from a Roman Catholic who possibly remains to some extent in communion with the Church of his baptism. Circumstances may have been hard on him, or he may have ill digested his circumstances; but no one, not even of the most liberal Catholics who are loyal to the Pope, could write in the spirit of the articles and letters referred to, which from beginning to end place even facts so as to lose all proportion and perspective, and distort and exaggerate, misstate, state what we know positively to be untrue, with an ability and malevolence which strike painfully French lay Catholics who read the *Times*, and still more painfully, and with a sense of shame, the present writer, when Church of England newspapers accept such correspondents as their authority. The few Frenchmen, lay and cleric, who read these Church of England papers are surprised, and have expressed their opinion that the choice of these correspondents has been, to say the least, unfortunate. It is, however, to their anonymous authorship we chiefly object. What would be thought if we, or any other member of the Church of England, undertook to supply *La Croix*, for instance, with Church of England controversies, or merely with an annotated edition of the Blue-books of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, even if done in a different spirit from that which breathes through the writers we complain of? It may not be useless to add that a distinguished French jurist had the curiosity to wade through the four volumes of Blue-books referred to. He is no ultramontane nor *intransigeant*; he is full of common sense, and is a strong Churchman; he knows about as little as most of his countrymen as to the Church of England; added to which he is chronically amazed at the illogicalness of the English. We fear his amazement was not lessened, nor his respect increased, by the perusal of these Blue-books. Inevitably he exaggerated the importance of their contents. To him it seemed a revelation of petty intrigue and spying, of ignorant bigotry and personalities on the part of the extreme Protestants; as well as of leaders of both sexes of the various Protestant associations, whose zeal seemed to him often to lack the spirit of reverence and charity. He failed to understand the bishops and marvelled how certain clergy of the High Church party, if really sure of their tenets and faith, of their orders and sacraments, could attach supreme importance to accessories, however desirable, if not obligatory; and which, as causes of controversy, might retard the acceptance of the teaching intended to be inculcated. We succeeded to a considerable extent in reducing his impressions to more accurate proportions, but, nevertheless, there has remained in the Frenchman's mind this: that extreme pettiness, and a foolish, unworthy, and even un-Christian temper characterised the proceedings of the more Protestant; and that, with perhaps

two exceptions, the witnesses were confused and feeble; and that as for the Commissioners they were indeed what might be expected from such incoherence as is represented by English religious thought and teaching! We have been more successful in dealing with signed letters and speeches regarding the Church of England which occasionally are quoted in French papers; for we can explain the weight of Mr. Fillingham's 'honest verdict on Anglican Orders;' also, having the honour of the acquaintance of the Archbishop of Canterbury and of many of the bishops, as well as knowing more or less of them all, we could vouch that the portraits drawn by Dr. Clifford were not from the life by a dispassionate Churchman, but were the inspirations of a fervid Nonconformist imagination; and again and again in the weary course of the Education Bill campaign did we point out that not even when suddenly clutching the sword of faith, and swearing by all the Thirty-nine Articles at once as a true member of the Church of England, were members of Parliament, otherwise not often found occupied in her interests and service, to be taken as mouthpieces of the more instructed and chronicly zealous Churchmen. But enough of this. The *entente cordiale* certainly tends to accustom the French and English nations to each other's grimaces and noises; that is something. Four years living wholly with the French, and among the French, in a wholly French *milieu*, only confirms us daily in the realisation of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of the English mind understanding the French, and *vice versa*; and in nothing is this more the case than in matters of religion; of etiquette; of wit, sense of humour, jokes. It is also difficult as to politics. As to religion, the complexities in England are resolved for almost every Frenchman into Protestant and Catholic; while for our own countrymen, in this enlightened twentieth century, religion in France is considered by a great majority of the British as

unfortunately Catholic; but still if it were not for the Pope and Rome it would not much matter; there are fortunately many Protestants who escaped the Edict of Nantes and all that, you know, just as we have our Dissenters; and if the Pope would only not interfere all would arrange itself as well as it can in a Catholic country, and the French Government would not be obliged to interfere either, and anyhow it is all the fault of the Pope now. Not that I am at all prejudiced; everyone respects him in Rome, and I even asked for an audience myself; only, just as I say to the Ritualists, you are neither one thing nor the other, be honestly Roman Catholic or Protestant; so I say, let the Pope manage his own affairs and keep to Italy and leave the French to manage theirs.

This *quotation* represents in a somewhat confused and not very relevant style the bulk of English public opinion as to the present Church question in France; and observant readers of the newspapers referred to, cannot have failed to notice the cleverness with which the red herrings are drawn and redrawn across the scent. Pope, and all which Rome represents; supposed jealousies of regulars and seculars;

(one seems to see the models of the witty sculptures of the Middle Ages reawakened to play their part). In more delicate handling references are made to intellectual sufferings, to the tyranny of the Index, to philosophy and exegesis crushed. *A propos* of the regulars and seculars, perhaps many in England do not know that before the expulsion of the religious Orders there were barely ten thousand monks who were priests as against the sixty thousand secular clergy now in France. And yet repeatedly we have seen it stated in English newspapers that the Pope's purpose and desire is to replace the secular by the regular clergy in the French parishes. This, indeed, was urged as an excuse, as the reason, for the impertinent conditions imposed by the Minister of Public Worship in the proposed contracts between clergy and municipal councils, that not only no foreigners (foreigners in villages!) but no regular clergy would be allowed as curés.

Human nature is the same everywhere, and doubtless there are individual preferences and prejudices among the clergy in France as among the clergy in other countries and Churches, and even occasionally among the laity. With the exception, however, of the Jesuits, there is no foundation whatever for the idea that there exists now in France any jealousy whatever of the regular clergy by the secular, or of the seculars by the regulars. Prejudices and preferences are to be found among themselves as to individuals, whether regulars or seculars, but not by the secular body of the body of regular clergy. There are many individual Jesuit priests who are much loved, esteemed, and trusted in France; but as a corporation the Jesuits seem to us to be looked upon more as a caste apart, to be looked at askance even, almost disliked, in a way not to be wondered at perhaps, representing as they do an organisation, though a long way behind the Freemasons, yet still very remarkable in solidarity, effectiveness, discipline. Remarkable also for the perfection of detail and application, of machinery and system in ethics, theology, philosophy, learning generally, and applied sciences; but all within an iron boundary of administrative authority, fossilised authority, which inevitably meets with increasing difficulties within the Church even, and would strike us as a dyke without a lock, doomed not only to be lost itself in a devastating flood, but to submerge and injure what it should have served to nourish and refresh, but for our certainty that so noble and devoted an Order will in the time of Providence understand and adjust its magnificent powers to the Divine Will, working on in new, or changed, manifestations of the same central Truth for which the Company of Jesus, from their great Founder downwards, have worked, and meant to work, whatever may have been, may be, their mistakes or failures. Thus much for the regulars and seculars. Now for Rome. Here let us quote the Archbishop of Besançon and Monsieur Georges Picot, member of the Institut de France, and

perpetual secretary of the Academy of Sciences Morales et Politiques,[1] whose absolute absence of the spirit of 'intransigeance' is proved by the fact that in the thickest of the Dreyfus storm he was one of the few who openly expressed their indignation at the showing to the military tribunal some *pièces d'accusation* not shown to Dreyfus's lawyers. Since, most people allow the whole procedure to have been grossly mismanaged, but then Monsieur Picot was almost alone; and that although neither then nor now convinced of Dreyfus's innocence. We say nor now, since in France no change whatever has been made in public opinion by the late acquittal. The late proceeding of the Cour de Cassation was without precedent in thus unconstitutionally closing the matter, instead of, as always, sending back for fresh trial by a military court—and no doubt could be entertained of the capacity of the Government to see that the court was composed of unprejudiced members. This is referred to here as the surest way of inspiring the English public with confidence in Monsieur Picot, who also is one of those who signed the laymen's letter begging for the acceptance of the Associations Cultuelles. Speaking to us of the misunderstandings and misrepresentations in the English press (he is an English scholar), he said a few days ago that the campaign against the Church in France is worked by the Freemasons, and that Christianity is the object—twenty, even ten, years ago such a speech as Monsieur Viviani's in November last would not have been possible; for even those not Catholic were Deists and respected religion—that that speech, with its unblushing declaration of what had been achieved, and of the final blotting out of Christian light and faith, of the mockeries of Christian hope and prayer, had served as a great *push* to the campaign of the atheistic schoolmasters all over the country; that the voting by the Chamber to have this speech posted up in every commune was the triumph of Freemasonry. Monsieur Picot went on in his constitutionally hopeful spirit to the one cheering feature in this time of trial—the solid unity of Catholics finding their strength and rallying-point in their chief and centre, the Pope. He expressed the admiration he felt for British and Irish patriotism in times of national danger and struggle, instancing in particular the solid front made by British and Irish of all parties and of all opinions during the Transvaal war:

> There were many differences of opinion before and after as to the policy which led to the war, but during the war, with very few insignificant exceptions, all divisions and criticisms were put aside, and the thought of country united you all. That, alas, in our politics seems impossible; but we in France find the same strength and unity in our Faith; and whatever differences of opinion

[1] He was formerly Judge of the Tribunal de la Seine and Director of the Criminal Department of the Ministry of Justice; a man whose friendship is an honour, whether from the intellectual, philanthropic, or Christian point of view, as will testify our mutual friend, Lord Reay.

there have been and are as to policy (these are mere tactics), we follow our General, we gather round our chief, and happy indeed we are to have this uniting head-centre—it is that which your newspapers misunderstand and consequently misrepresent. Among ourselves we may grumble and criticise this and that in detail; but for us the Holy Father is the earthly father of this family, the Catholic Church; and the one, only, united body of Frenchmen of all opinions and thoughts is the body of Catholics united in and under the Pope.

The Archbishop of Besançon (Monseigneur Fulbert Petit) expressed this truism speaking of the Government: 'Whether they like it or not, the fact remains that the Pope is the head of the Catholic Church.'

It will interest those wishing to know the truth as to the Associations Cultuelles and the French Episcopate to read a letter from Monseigneur Fulbert Petit on the subject. We give the original and a translation. In a letter addressed to the *Daily Telegraph* (the 29th of March, 1907) we said that we were authorised to state that the whole episcopate, excepting two bishops only,[2] voted against the possibility of accepting the Associations Cultuelles, such as defined by the Separation Law of 1905, and that a majority of the episcopate voted that a scheme for statutes for *Associations Canoniques* which should specially qualify Catholic Associations Cultuelles should be presented to the Pope for his judgment. The author of this scheme being the Archbishop of Besançon, Monseigneur Fulbert Petit, his condemnation of the Associations Cultuelles and the intrusion of the Conseil d'Etat into spiritual matters, in his pastoral of the 29th of January, 1907, seemed worth quoting, and was quoted in the letter referred to. But the Montagnini papers have seemed to the world of journalists a welcome proof that 'we were always right'—that the Pope had lied, and that the whole episcopate of France had been coerced into submission; whereas the Montagnini papers merely echo and re-echo more or less accurately the babel of tongues and discussions when all the world ecclesiastic and lay was trying to make up its mind. Let Monseigneur Fulbert Petit speak:

Archevêché de Besançon: Le 11 Avril, 1907.

Non, certes, l'on n'a aucun motif d'accuser le Souverain Pontife d'avoir blessé la vérité dans sa seconde Encyclique. Ce qu'il y expose est absolument exact.

Après la première Encyclique condamnant la Loi de Séparation, et dans leur première Assemblée plénière, les évêques de France furent consultés, non pas sur *la légitimité de la Loi* puisqu'elle était condamnée, mais sur cette double question:

Primo.—Les évêques pensent-ils qu'il fut possible, *pratiquement*, d'accepter les Associations Cultuelles, telles qu'elles sont déterminées par la Loi de Séparation, sans porter atteinte à la divine constitution de l'Eglise, à ses droits, et à sa hiérarchie? Les évêques, à la presque unanimité (ferè ad unum) et très librement, ont repondu: Non.

[2] One of the minority of two begged that his vote might be transferred to the majority, urging that he had misunderstood the terms of the motion. The cardinals who presided ruled that his vote be reckoned in the minority.

Secundo.—Les évêques pensent-ils qu'il serait possible de constituer des associations qui, sans violer la Loi de Séparation, maintiendraient saufs les droits essentiels de l'Eglise, sa divine constitution et sa hierarchie ?

La majorité de l'Assemblée pensa que cela était possible, et le dit très librement ; mais se soumettant respectueusement son opinion au jugement du Pape.

Celui-ci, après avoir réfléchi et prié, usa du droit que Lui donne son suprême magistère. Dans sa seconde Encyclique, Il proclama, d'accord avec la presque unanimité de l'Episcopat (ferè ad unum) qu'on ne pouvait instituer des Associations Cultuelles telles que les prévoit la Loi de Séparation, sans violer la constitution divine, les lois et la hiérarchie de l'Eglise, et qu'elles restent définitivement condamnées.

Quant aux Associations proposées par les évêques avec des Statuts établis par eux, le Pape jugea qu'Il ne pouvait en autoriser l'essai ' *tant que ne Lui serait pas donnée la garantie certaine et légale que, dans ces Associations, la constitution, les droits, la hiérarchie et les biens de l'Eglise seraient en pleine sécurité.*' Cette garantie *certaine* et *légale* l'épiscopat ne pouvait pas la Lui donner. Les Pouvoirs publics, seuls, le pouvaient faire. S'ils avaient donné cette certitude légale, la conciliation pouvait être tentée.

Ils ne l'ont pas voulu.[3]

De même que les évêques avaient fait connaître *librement* leur pensée, aussi *librement* ils ont adhéré à la décision du Souverain Pontife, sans hésitation et sans exception.

Telles ont été, très exactement, la position et la solution de la question.

L'Eglise n'a jamais voulu la guerre. Depuis 1905 le Gouvernement n'a jamais voulu sincèrement la paix ; puisqu'il n'a jamais voulu consentir une législation que le dogme et la conscience catholiques pussent accepter.

Voilà exclusivement pourquoi la lutte religieuse existe en France, aussi préjudiciable à l'Etat qu'à l'Eglise, et tout à fait en opposition avec le véritable intérêt social.

Je crois, Madame la Comtesse, avoir répondu à votre question et je n'ai aucun motif de ne point vous autoriser à user de cette loyale réponse, absolument exempte de passion et de parti-pris.

(Signé) ✠ FULBERT ARCHEVÊQUE DE BESANÇON.

TRANSLATION.

No, certainly, there is no reason to accuse the Sovereign Pontiff of having said less than the truth in his second Encyclical. That which he there states is absolutely exact. After the first Encyclical condemning the Separation Law, and in their first General Assembly, the bishops of France were consulted, not as to the *justice of the Law*, since the Law had been condemned, but on this double question :

First.—Did the bishops think it possible, *practically*, to accept the Associations Cultuelles, such as they were defined by the Separation Law, without injuring the divine constitution of the Church, her rights and her hierarchy ? The bishops almost unanimously (*ferè ad unum*) and very spontaneously answered ' No.'

Secondly.—Did the bishops think it would be possible to constitute associa-

[3] To us the reflections by M. Anatole Leroy Beaulieu as to the sense of insecurity felt by the Pope (pp. 537–538, *Revue de Paris*, December 1906) seem a noteworthy commentary on the Papal decision, the writer being one of the most keenly desirous of acquiescence in the law, Associations Cultuelles and all. These reflections are not based on suppositions, but on facts, as to what changes took place favourable to, and finally unfavourable to, a real security against schism and for the hierarchical constitution required by the Catholic Church.

tions which, without infringing the Separation Law, would maintain safely the essential rights of the Church, her divine constitution and hierarchy?

The majority of the Assembly thought it was possible, and said so very freely, but always submitting their opinion respectfully to the judgment of the Pope; who, after having pondered and prayed, exercised his right as supreme magistrate.

In his second Encyclical he proclaimed, in accordance with the almost unanimous episcopate (*ferè ad unum*), that it was not possible to institute Associations Cultuelles such as the Separation Law defines, without violating the divine constitution, the laws and the hierarchy of the Church, and that they (the Associations Cultuelles) are finally condemned.

As to the Associations with Statutes, proposed by the bishops, the Pope decided that he could not authorise the experiment, '*so long as he should have no certain and legal guarantee that in these Associations the constitution, the rights, the hierarchy, and the property of the Church should be fully safeguarded.*'

This *certain and legal* guarantee the bishops were unable to give. The public authorities only could give it. If they had given legal certainty, conciliation could be tried.

They were not willing to give it.

Just as the bishops had freely expressed their views, equally freely did they embrace the decision of the Sovereign Pontiff; without hesitation and without exception.

Such were, very exactly, the position and the solution of the question.

The Church has never desired war. The Government since 1905 has never sincerely desired peace, inasmuch as it has never been willing for legislation which Catholic dogma and conscience could accept. This is exclusively the reason of the religious struggle going on in France, as harmful to the State as to the Church, and altogether opposed to the true interests of society (public interest).

I believe that I have answered your questions, and I have no reason not to authorise you to make use of this honest answer, absolutely free of passion or of *parti-pris.*

As regards the *Mémoire* by Monseigneur Fuzet, Archbishop of Rouen, written at the time these matters were in practical discussion, and comparing the German (more exactly Prussian) law for associations with the French Associations Cultuelles, Monsieur Armand Lods, jurisconsult (a Protestant and occasional contributor to the *Journal des Débats*), writes:

There is no true comparison possible between the German Church councils and parochial assemblies and the French Associations Cultuelles.

1. The German assemblies were established *to administer property* (§ 1 loi 20 juin, 1875),

while the French Associations Cultuelles were limited to *responsibility for public worship.* Until the (supplementary) law of the 2nd of January 1907, the Government (French) insisted that there could be no public worship without Associations Cultuelles.[4]

[4] 'To punish the Catholic Church for its resistance, and while still prosecuting individuals (clergy) the Government passed a law which, while confiscating immediately the property of the vestries and *menses*, allowed public worship under these conditions:

(1) By Association Cultuelles of the Separation Law, the 9th of December 1905.

(2) By Associations under the Common Law of the 1st of July 1901.

2. German 'cultuelles' are free to minister to the poor and to have schools; can receive legacies and gifts (§ 3 loi 20 juin, 1875).

Their patrimony is not limited. They may receive contributions from the faithful on the lines of ordinary public rates. The powers of the French Associations Cultuelles are very different. They are forbidden the care of the poor or of schools; they are absolutely limited to the charge of public worship. (Article 19, the 9th of December, 1905, Sep. Law). They are disqualified from receiving gifts or legacies, and their reserve funds are strictly limited (*i.e.* Associations Cultuelles are forbidden to possess more than such and such a sum in reserve). The more closely I study the more convinced I am that it was *impossible* for the Pope to accept the Associations Cultuelles. In accepting he would have allowed the Government to impose a Protestant organisation on the Catholic Church. It would have been a new civil constitution of the clergy. For the matter of that the members of the Government did not hide their projects.

Read Briand's speeches. See what was written by his inspirer, by the real director of public worship. 'Three words (*les Associations Cultuelles*) express the new régime to which all the religious bodies in France (*tous les cultes*) must shortly conform. These three words seem alarming to the Roman Church, for which they announce that which is nothing short of a revolution, the intrusion of the lay element into the direction of ecclesiastical matters. Protestantism receives them (these three words) without serious misgiving, because they belong to an order of events which our (Protestant) forefathers, as it were, foresaw and realised some centuries ago; so true is it that they were forerunners in all which concerns social and religious liberty' ('Foi et Vie,' No. du 1 août, 1905).

To return to the Archbishop of Besançon's letter. He wrote:

As to the Associations with Statutes proposed by the bishops, the Pope decided that he could not authorise the experiment so long as he should have no certain and legal guarantee that in these Associations the constitutions, the rights, the hierarchy, and the property of the Church should be fully safeguarded.'

The bishops were unable to give this guarantee. The State would not. There lies the crux.

After studying carefully all published opinions, legal and lay, in favour of trying the Associations Cultuelles; after hearing all that could be urged in favour, we have been depressingly impressed by the absence of any security whatever, any sure guarantee of any legal security beyond the hard naked words of the naked Law of the 9th of December, 1905 (particularly as regards Articles 4 and 8), and even as to these, is it possible to speak of security? Doubtless, were laws in France now even only as obscure as are parliamentary Bills at home, and were the administration on a level above any suspicion, some reasonable dependence might have been placed on the *absence* of any *prohibition* as to clerics; and in the words 'aux règles d'organisation générale du culte dont elles (associations cultuelles) proposaient d'assurer l'exercise' inserted in article 4 by Monsieur Briand, at

(3) By meetings organised by individual initiative under article 25, law, the 9th of December 1905.

This is the law referred to of the 2nd of January, 1907, and necessitated annual declarations instead of before each service. The law of the 28th of March 1907 abolished all declarations.'—Armand Lods, *Révue de Droit et de Jurisprudence des Eglises séparées de l'Etat.*

the instance of Monsieur Ribot and the Liberals (Opposition), the sanguine found their encouragement and comfort—dashed later on, it is true, by 'the bloc' in revenge, voting article 8, which seemed intended to reopen article 4 and to nullify the guarantees there accorded. 'The door which article 4 seemed to close on schism, as with a bolt, seemed surreptitiously reopened by article 8. At least, so it was judged by a great number of ecclesiastics, and by the greater number of Catholic lawyer-jurists' (A. Leroy Beaulieu, *Revue de Paris*, Dec. 1906, p. 538). Monsieur Armand Lods was of the same opinion.

Nevertheless, it is still often urged that 'probably—there is no reason to the contrary if so desired—the Associations Cultuelles could even have been entirely composed of clergy, since this is not *prohibited* by the law' (the law requires a minimum number of seven, fifteen, or twenty-five members, according to population, so clearly this remark only applies to large town parishes); and an eminent lawyer, Monsieur Michoud, of the University of Grenoble, in *La Revue de Lagrésille*, wrote:

> The law does not name the bishop, but that is to leave him liberty. The law does not speak of him expressly that he may be master . . . the law of 1905 does not speak of the bishop, but makes him omnipotent. The Prussian law speaks of the bishop, but it is to make him subservient. . . .

The same writer explains that this omnipotence of the bishop, this absolute liberty, dictatorship even if desired, is to be secured by the statutes conditioning the new corporations, heirs to the vestries—*i.e.* Associations Cultuelles—the bishop could be independent of all control whether by laymen or prefect. And yet, we would observe, the culte is absolutely in the hands of the Association Cultuelle, and the Court of Appeal in all cases of dispute is the Conseil d'Etat. The intentions of the law are interpreted by Monsieur Michoud in a spirit of charity which hopeth all things and thinketh no evil; and yet there is at least a responsibility of prudence and judgment where, as in the whole of the Separation Law, there is no recognition whatever of the hierarchy as regards the Roman Catholic Church, no distinction whatever being made between the three religious bodies, although the Protestant, Israelitish, and Catholic Churches are so fundamentally different in their constitutions. All appeals would have been to the 'Conseil d'Etat,' of which the Archbishop of Besançon writes (Pastoral, January 29, 1907): 'A tribunal composed exclusively of laymen, Christians, freethinkers, Jews, empowered to pronounce as final court of appeal on a question which only the ecclesiastical authority has the mission to decide. It is the intolerable incursion of the civil power into spiritual matters.'

M. Armand Lods, the Protestant jurist already quoted, allows us to name him as one who cannot claim to share that trust in and admiration of the 'Conseil d'Etat' expressed by some authorities; and we own we have been painfully impressed by the widespread distrust of

the 'Conseil d'Etat.' We have ourselves realised it among many Protestants and Freethinkers, as well as Catholics, all eminently qualified to judge. It would, indeed, be extraordinary if independent judgments were never given; but the instances are sufficiently rare to cause surprise. Since July 1879, when three-quarters of the 'Conseil d'Etat' were *révoqués* (dismissed), and the remaining fourth resigned in protest, the independent character of the tribunal has disappeared.[5]

In the face of reiterated refusals to name bishops or curés, or to recognise in any way the hierarchy, during the discussion in the Chamber on the Separation Law; in the face of most honest and open declarations on the part of Ministers and followers, in public and private, as to the intentions and hopes regarding the Separation Bill; in view of the past twenty, nearly thirty years of constant anti-Christian legislation, of bad faith and illiberal action of the Ministries which to our thinking thus dishonour the ideal of a Republic, we are amazed at the hopefulness and really remarkable patience with the Government, and almost pathetic desire to go on trusting on the part of many; such as the two priest-deputies, Abbés Gayraud and Lemire, whose whole desires are the good of their country in the way which to them seems the only way, the way of Christianity. As an instance of this it may be mentioned that Abbé Gayraud lately tried to excuse the melancholy anti-Christian incidents in regard to the Iéna disaster, as having arisen from some misunderstanding. 'Not at all,' answered Monsieur Clemenceau; 'there was no misunderstanding.' (It is fair to say that Monsieur Clemenceau is quite open in his aims and actions, it is his interpreters who do him the wrong to colour his portraits for British tastes and opinions.) Abbé Lemire, it may be remembered, last winter was cheered to the echo for his assurance he still believed in good intentions; and we personally hope he may keep his optimist spirit to the death, there is none too much of it in France; but Abbé Lemire will lead no one, still less the Catholic Church, to disaster, even should his simple confidingness not find its reward. For Pius the Tenth the responsibility is different, and this is realised by none more than by the noble, keen, staunch band of Catholics who

[5] The Conseil d'Etat, however, delivered a judgment worthy of its ancient, as against its modern, reputation some six weeks ago; when it condemned the retention by the Minister of Public Worship of the certificates sent up as usual last year by priests and seminarists to receive the 'visa' of the Minister, without which no 'dispense' could be had from further military service; and for lack of which five thousand French citizens who had served their year and hitherto been 'dispensés' were recalled to serve two further years of the three years' term, when that term had already, in 1906, been altered for a term of two years' military service. The Conseil d'Etat further allowed *seminarists*, having no certificate of employment now recognised by the State, if they had served their year under the old military law, to avail themselves, if only sons, sons of widows, &c., of these qualifications for 'dispenses' under the old military law; by the law of 1906 for term of two years all exemptions are abolished.

signed the letter to the French episcopate urging that the Associations Cultuelles should not be rejected. Men such as Monsieur Thureau Dangin, Lapparent (the geologist), Anatole Leroy Beaulieu, the Marquis de Vogüé, the Comte d'Haussonville, the Vicomte de Meaux (son-in-law of the great Montalembert and himself famous for his services under the Empire and afterwards under the Republic with Marshal MacMahon); Baron Denys Cochin;[6] 'and, following in unison, men of letters, lawyers, deputies, most of whom were known in the defence of the Church and of religious liberty.'[7]

Who can wonder at the letter referred to? at the *universal desire* to save from the wreck all that might lawfully be saved? and still more at the overpowering dread of accentuating the discord between Church and State; at risking giving any pretext for further anti-Christian legislation, or for that which is more insidious and therefore far more dangerous, risking the multiplication of petty anti-Christian tyrannies, of interference in the rights of conscience of individuals, of at every corner and every point possible breaking the links of the Christian past; secularising the history, the homes of the people of France; secularising the ambitions, the ideals, the standards of the people. Before such an awful problem would it have been possible, let alone creditable, that there should have been a ready-made unanimity of opinion, of unhesitating action, even had the Church under the Concordat enjoyed freedom of action and open discussion as a Corporation? We have been much impressed by the nobility and strength with which the French episcopate and clergy generally have stepped forth from the somewhat emasculating and paralysing *régime* of the Concordat. There is no just comparison possible to those

[6] The Baron Cochin's house had the honour of sheltering the Archbishop of Paris when he was turned out by the Government at nearly ninety years of age. The *Journal Officiel* before us reports, however, a remark of Monsieur Clemenceau laying the blame on Baron Cochin! saying that but for Monsieur Cochin the archbishop would still be in his old home!

[7] From *Revue de Paris*, December 1906: 'Rome, les Catholiques et la Séparation,' par Monsieur Anatole Leroy Beaulieu—a very interesting paper written from the most sanguine and conciliatory point of view, which, while giving credit to Monsieur Briand for the best intentions, presenting the Separation Law in the most favourable light, speaks clearly as to the absolute need of official relations with Rome; of the anti-Christian spirit pervading the political campaigns of recent years against the Church; of the absolute loyalty to Rome of French Catholics; and of the utter confusion of the law and its interpreters. 'The gravest questions surge on all sides, without a definite answer from the law. The proof of this lies in the different and often opposite interpretations which have been given by the press, jurists, politicians, &c. . . . not even the clearest articles of the law but are disputed, and often opposed, by the very groups which demand the integral application of the law; as if for certain legislators the integral application of the law should consist in depriving the clergy of the benefit of those articles which are favourable, while requiring the carrying out by the clergy of such articles as seem the contrary. For those who consider facts rather than words the law remains valid for Protestants and Jews; it exists only nominally as regards Catholics; the small proportion which is capable of application to Catholics is obscure and uncertain, and therefore precarious and arbitrary.'

who have known intimately and practically the conditions of the Church of England as by law established, between that establishment and the Church of France under the Concordat. In view of the unknown, and in the circumstances of modern France, including the bitterly hostile anti-Christian spirit of the 'bloc,' probably all Catholics, who are sincere, would have agreed in deprecating the rupture, even though under conditions such as might have been expected from the Government of a civilised nation; whereas in regard to England we should regard the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church as the greatest possible national calamity, and without any equivalent compensation.

Monsieur Picot, already quoted, writes thus as to the present difference between Church and State in France:

The 7th of April, 1907.—It is impossible to refute with greater exactness the errors which prevail.* What you explain is absolutely clear, and I think in so doing you are discharging a duty. The more I consider the events of which we have been witnesses, the more I am impressed by the general reasons, which over and above reasons of detail, decided the Pope. Yes, the Associations Cultuelles *might* seriously injure the hierarchy of the Church; yes, the Conseil d'Etat *was* constituted judge in ecclesiastical matters. The Pope *had* lawful grounds of complaint against this organisation. But all this is insufficient to explain what has happened. That which Rome was unable to accept is that the State in France should create an organisation for the Church without any prior mutual understanding. The fundamental principle in these matters is the agreement of the two powers, spiritual and temporal. History shows that in all ages the Popes and the Kings of France negotiated together for the treaties under various names which from 1516 have been defined as *concordats*. Each time that a King wished to act alone the Pope protested, and the agreement broken for an instant was re-established. And now we have the State, successor to the Kings, declaring its unalterable intention never again to negotiate with Rome, and promulgating without the Pope a law ruling the organisation of the Catholic worship. It was impossible for Rome to pass over such a violation of fundamental principles. It was no question of pride, but of sheer necessity arising from the nature of the two powers.

That which the old jurists called 'questions mixtes' is essentially true of the two Powers. Kings may be succeeded by republics, but the situation remains the same.

I think strongly that this, the real explanation and reason of what has happened, ought to have been stated more plainly; one traces it as the reason in all. Not a single pontifical act but shows this. I suspect it has been left to commentators to proclaim it. I believe that in stating this you would render great service.

This same point has been the constant theme of the *Journal des Débats*, that most conciliatory of newspapers; and has also been admirably expressed by Monsieur Anatole Leroy Beaulieu in the *Revue de Paris*. He writes:

Though this mutual goodwill (under the Concordat) continued equally on one side and on the other under different monarchies, it has not continued the

* Referring to our recent contributions on this subject.—S. M. P. F.

same during the last quarter of a century, and particularly during the last few years. Goodwill was still to be found in Rome, as habitually, where separation was dreaded; where to prevent it Leo the Thirteenth resigned himself to many a sacrifice. Goodwill was less in Paris, where the tendency was more and more to consider the treaty of 1801 as a *régime* of special favour to the profit of the Church, rather than as a convention advantageous to both parties. For the continuance of a Concordat a spirit of peace is necessary in every country, in the State and in the Church; a sincere desire to terminate all difficulties by agreement, instead of by embittering them. Since the Republic, *or rather the republican party*, engaged in a war (*lutte*) against the clergy, against the religious orders, against all Catholic influences, the Concordat has lost much of its practical virtue as well as of its moral authority. The tendency has been to make an instrument of war of that which should be an instrument of peace. . . . The Concordat which had withstood so many revolutions was in danger of being swept away in some moment when least expected; the day when, in the ardour of battle against the clergy, a Minister should be found bold enough, or rash enough, to lay his hand upon it (the Concordat). It is this which explains why it was denounced by a Ministry which in its programme had promised to respect the Concordat; and why the Separation was voted by a parliament of which the majority had pronounced against Separation, or had not demanded it in their professions of their opinions. The Separation was voted in haste at the close of a parliament without putting the question formally before the country; as if the rupture of a treaty of centuries, which no one thought at hand a few months earlier, had suddenly become of such urgency that it would have been perilous to defer it.

Monsieur Anatole Leroy Beaulieu, after treating clearly and with great impartiality all that ensued, in speaking of the refusal by the Catholics, under the lead of Rome, to form Associations Cultuelles, says:

The co-operation of clergy and laity was necessary for the application of the law, and this co-operation priests and laymen declared themselves conscientiously unable to give. And, be it remembered, to put the law in check there was no need to revolt; it is sufficient not to co-operate, which in no country constitutes rebellion. This was formally acknowledged by the Minister of Public Worship to the Chamber of Deputies. This refusal to co-operate had never been thought possible by the law-maker, although the dissatisfaction of Catholics ought to have warned him. He had reckoned without the Pope and without Catholic discipline. From this arose the present troubles, difficulties, hesitations. . . . One thing is certain, the separation will work out in conditions wholly different from those foreseen by the law of 1905.

He endorses our personal experience when he says:

Whether priests or laity, the French Catholics have lost faith in the good faith and in the impartiality of the Government; and if there are those who do not doubt its goodwill, they doubt its having energy or power to keep its promises.—(*Revue de Paris*, December 1906, p. 540.)

The opinions of lawyers differ occasionally in England, even of judges; so it has been on this question of Association Cultuelles in France. And if Monsieur Grousseau and Monsieur Flourens, among others who saw at least no security against schisms and invasion of the spirituality by the temporality in the Associations Cultuelles of the

Separation Law, had weight and influenced the Pope in his decision, one thing is certain. The risk, the certainty rather, he chose was this. Poverty and uncertainty for his bishops and clergy in France; of abandoning all the earthly pride and consecrated treasures of the past in France; all certain material means of securing the supply of clergy even; of being represented as indifferent or careless as to the sufferings he entailed on the clergy and Catholic laity of another country; of desiring strife rather than peace; of wilful *intransigeance*. And all this was faced and risked by Pius the Tenth rather than risk in the slightest degree any loss or harm to the spiritual position and permanent freedom of the spiritual life and work not only of the Church in France, but of the whole Roman Catholic Church throughout the world. Looking back through the annals of the Papacy (which we had better own at once we have only known in any fulness through Ranke, Creighton, Pastor, and of these Bishop Creighton remains predominant in our memory), nothing strikes us as more essentially in harmony with the spirit of the Apostles, with that of the first Bishop of Rome, than this act of Pius the Tenth, whether wise or foolish from a worldly point of view. He sees his charge as a whole, and in the strength and enlightenment of God just did what he believed his duty; and as in politics, in work of whatever sort, we only see clearly and act strongly, by looking out, through and above the dust and noise of the pettiness of daily life, so, despite the dust and pettiness of the Montagnini papers, we see loyalty uniting all in the new experiences of the Church in France; and we can imagine St. Catharine of Siena smiling at the fuss made over the whole Montagnini business; telling us to pity the want of honour and breeding in the men in power who could stoop to steal and publish private papers, not realising apparently the squalor of their conduct; but she would bid us rejoice that the worst revealed was petty gossip such as would strike no one in regard to any ordinary diplomat or court, excepting to marvel over the absence of anything worthy of the name of scandal. Here in these papers, even supposing them to be all unforged and undoctored (there were fifteen copyists, translators sworn to secrecy, nine translators not sworn, and many more second and third hand copyists—what a subject for the energies of political exegesists!), not a reputation but comes out untouched by the scandals over which she wept in her day;[9] and the only reproach possible to Rome is a want of

[9] Lest we should be charged with forgetting that which, in the *Times* of the 6th of April 1907, was thought worthy of a Reuter's telegram, we reproduce it here; and as a commentary an extract from the *Journal des Débats* of April 7:—

'LATEST' NEWS.

'THE FRENCH PREMIER AND M. PIOU.

'Paris, April 5.

'The *Matin* will to-morrow publish the following statement by M. Clemenceau:—

'"M. Piou is now reduced to diluting his lies. He has no other resource left. But why does he not have an explanation with Mgr. Montagnini, who plainly attributes

discernment in those employed and trusted, and (is it a reproach?) *no intriguing whatever against the Republic*,[10] but an extraordinary preference for Christian as against anti-Christian deputies in the Assembly which disposes of the earthly circumstances of the Church in France. This is all, excepting as regards intellectual questions, exegesis &c., which Monsignor Montagnini seems to have regarded as his duty to watch and report on, not always it seems with accurate knowledge or understanding; but, after sifting and classifying, this is the worst we find; and the farce called the trial of Abbé Jouin and his plot, is well exposed not only by his admirable counsel Maître Danet, but by the equally admirable judgment, in which the newly-made law was condemned as exorbitant, by which a French citizen could be fined sixteen francs (the smallest fine) for rousing his parishioners to work instead of only sighing; for saying that in such times of acute distress a *deuil armé* was needed; a remark understood in its harmless sense

to him the dishonourable language which he used? It is to his old friend that he should turn his attention if he had in him the smallest particle of the feeling of a truthful man. But there are only too many reasons why he should fear the answer. Of the two forms of confession he chooses the one which injures the man who is to-day his accuser. As the last straw he now seeks to drag a woman into the affair in the matter of the luncheon at which he endeavoured to meet me. The only thing that was wanting to him was to hide behind a petticoat. With Mgr. Montagnini's soutane, there are now two of these garments in the case." '—*Reuter.*

'PROPOS DE PREMIER MINISTRE.—M. Clemenceau est en train de perdre toute mesure et toute décence. Dans une déclaration qu'il a dictée à un journal du matin, en réponse aux explications plus ou moins heureuses de M. Piou, on relève, au milieu de beaucoup de phrases étranges ou injurieuses, celle-ci: "Pour comble, le voilà qui cherche à mettre une femme en cause dans l'affaire du déjeuner où il sollicita de me rencontrer. Il ne lui manquait plus que de se cacher derrière un jupon. *Avec celui de Montagnini, cela fait deux.*" Nous ne doutons pas que ce mot ait le succès qu'il mérite dans les établissements que Gambetta appelait les salons de la démocratie. Mais il existe d'autres salons où un ministre français est dans l'obligation de fréquenter. Il y a, ne fût-ce que dans le corps diplomatique, des personnalités que leurs fonctions mettent en rapports nécessaires avec le chef de notre gouvernement, et qui risquent de ne pas saisir du premier coup tout l'atticisme de semblables plaisanteries. Il y a des représentants catholiques d'Etats catholiques qui peuvent être un peu gênés d'entendre bafouer, fût-ce avec tant d'esprit, une robe qu'ils respectent. Il y a aussi une France, qui est une grande nation, qui occupe une grande place en Europe, qui s'avait gardé un grand renom de tenue et de courtoisie. Pour qualifier des propos comme ceux de notre premier ministre, il y a des mots qui viennent tout naturellement à l'esprit. On assure qu'ils ont franchi les lèvres d'un diplomate étranger. M. Clemenceau ne s'est pas borné à nous les faire connaître; il a tenu à les justifier.'

No scandal has remained; and the reputations of M. Clemenceau, M. Piou, and of Mgr. Montagnini have not been affected by the fact that the American artist, an acquaintance of M. Clemenceau's, and lodging in the same house as M. and Madame Piou, was a woman and not a man!

[10] Since writing this we have read in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 15, the 'Revue Chronique,' and wish space remained to quote every word regarding the Montagnini papers and the pretended Abbé Jouin's plot: Abbé Jouin, to whom no reference whatever was found in the papers—only a visiting card was found among the thousand and more the Government enjoyed studying. We can only quote this sentence from M. François Charmes's admirable résumé. 'Never did he' (Montagnini) 'direct his efforts or those of the Catholics against the Republic.'

just as much as we all understood Monsieur Clemenceau when lately he boasted that he had fired the first shot! The trial established that never had Abbé Jouin seen Montagnini, and that not once did he appear in the affair. Yet the seizure of the papers was made on the grounds of an Abbé Jouin plot!!! We have been reproached as lacking a spirit of tolerance in an article in another Review.[11] What does tolerance mean? Tolerance of evil? of anti-Christianism, of injustice, of French Freemasons? We were asked to throw such light as we had *at first hand* on the present ecclesiastical struggles in France, and unfortunately this is impossible without stating bravely (it is neither easy nor agreeable) the anti-Christian objects and methods of the present Government in all its ramifications of intensely centralised administration. It is absurd to attempt to explain the situation, and at the same time to ignore the chief factors on the side of evil—Freemasonry and the atheistical, fanatically anti-Christian, elementary school teachers; trained expressly in the *écoles normales*. Of course there are still many of the old race, who bitterly regret and bewail the poisoning of the race; but the whole current of the stream is a propaganda of atheism, and often also of anti-patriotism. To us it is wonderful that the *fond* of the country, of the people of France, retains so much virtue and faith as it does; this is the ground of our hope for the future. For a country and people so rich in qualities and endowments of all kinds, above all so rich still in Christian faith, there will surely be a recovery of noble, christian, patriotic life in the benign atmosphere of a Republic in which the motto 'Liberty, equality, fraternity' represents a living, gracious power, and not mere words which mock us from the walls of State buildings and of churches in town and country. We will close with this quotation from the *Revue de Droit et de Jurisprudence des Eglises séparées de l'Etat*, April 1907, p. 78:

It will be seen that the law of the 28th of March, 1907 (that which does away with all declarations) is characterised by true liberalism; the resistance of the Holy See has resulted in assuring to all religions the free practice of their rites, in freeing them of the useless and vexatious formality of declarations. The *Associations Cultuelles*, formed by Protestants and Israelites, need no longer renew annually the declarations of public worship which they had deposited at the prefecture of police or at the *mairie*. The Separation Law, such as it was promulgated in December 1905, has already undergone profound modifications; it would have been further greatly improved if the Government had not caused the Chambers to declare, in obedience to a small group blindly sectarian, the immediate confiscation of properties incontestably belonging to the Catholic Church.—(Armand Lods.)

SOPHIA M. PALMER,
Comtesse de Franqueville.

[11] *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1907.

THE HOMES OF OUR FOOD SUPPLY

A FEW years ago it so happened that I had to visit a farm not far from our shooting lodge in the Highlands of Scotland to inquire about supplies for the household before the great Twelfth of August was upon us. The walk through the woods was enchanting, with the squirrels chasing each other from tree to tree, the rabbits and roedeer darting off among the bracken, and the wild roses greeting me at every turn along the pathway. Crossing the river I paused to look over the bridge down into the depths of the pool wherein lay the salmon so stilly, then onward up the Ben. The silence was only broken by the steady murmur of the river, the cooing of the wood pigeons, and anon by the harsh 'koeck koeck' of the grouse among the heather. All was peace. It seemed as if nothing could disturb the serenity or dispel the sense of gratitude that the world was so fair and in all directions displayed her varying charms. Truly it was enough to live.

In the midst of this great solitude I came to the farm of my quest, and was invited into the parlour—that best room used only on state occasions, and on which the position and dignity of the family are known to depend. The state occasion had come, for on a couch lay a young girl in the last stage of consumption, or, to use the mother's phrase, 'decline.' There was no hesitation shown in discussing the case before the girl herself. It was the will of the Almighty. The hand of God was upon her, and in deepest reverence they bowed to His will.

Here, then, in the midst of all these natural charms, with Nature's children sporting happily about, lay a young human being nipped in the bud, the victim of human ignorance, or, in other words, of the fatal concatenation of circumstances, 'the seed, the soil, and surroundings.' Needless to say, not a breath of the sweet mountain air was allowed to enter this sunless chamber of death and solitude. On the walls were signs of damp and mould, but ignorance knew not the significance, and was content. Taking leave of the dying girl, I stepped outside to join the father, who was busy among the cows in the byre (cow-house). Here, again, were all the elements which breed disease. The dust of ages hung on the walls; ventilation was unknown, its need unrecognised. The low buildings formed three sides of a square

of the usual type, the dwelling-house forming the fourth, with a roadway between. The windows as a rule ignored the glorious expanse of mountains and pure oxygen on the one side, and faced the square for convenience and shelter. In the byre the cows were all tied up with their heads to the blank wall, and next door came the dairy, with the churns, milk pails, and pans airing in front. In the middle of the square was the usual dung-heap, that pestilential accumulation of decomposing matter which all farmers treasure as manure for their fields, without reckoning that what may be right in one place may be wrong in another. Instead of protecting their families and clean living animals from contact with this seething, steaming mass of putrefaction they seemed to live around it as a guard of honour! It was painful to think of the awful nights so many living creatures must suffer when doors were shut, and they were left to lie sweating in their own dew till released next morning. Still, the cows and the horses were better off than the poor sick girl, who was doomed to wait for death to release her from the 'night sweats' which were regarded as a natural symptom of the disease. The creatures who suffered least were the cocks and hens, who took matters into their own hands—if I may say so—and led a free life among the heather on which they love to feed when it is in full bloom. This imparts to the flesh a gamey flavour which makes a welcome variety in the *menu du jour* of a country house; and as this was the object of my visit I was able to make satisfactory arrangements and stroll homeward, no longer awake to the beauties of nature, but painfully alive to the penalties which come of ignorance.

Over all these hills and glens there were farms of a similar kind, some more dilapidated, others less, but all plague-spots from accumulated filth and the overcrowding of families. Fortunately, lack of space within drove the children without as soon as the sun was up, the elder taking part in the farmwork, the younger nursing those below them; but behind the scenes there was not infrequently the 'objeck' (idiot) or sick bairn to be attended to. These were regarded as pure waste in the general economy, for there was no 'eddication' to be done when they could not walk miles through rain and snow to the 'schule' carrying their books, and their peat bricks as tribute to the schoolroom fire. The two prevalent diseases in that part of Scotland were consumption and cancer, and as neither doctors nor trained nurses were to be had, it was quite usual to find a consumptive girl utilised as nurse to the old people dying of the latter disease.

Another farmer whom I knew (in England) enjoyed the reputation of being the prosperous man of the place. He did not profess to be a farmer *pur et simple*, but eked out a very good living by odd jobs in the way of carpentry, so while sending out milk from his own cows he could also supply coffins and various other trifles. Now, under the Act of 1885 'A person who sells milk of his own cows in small quanti-

ties to his workmen or neighbours, for their accommodation, shall not, for the purposes of registration, be deemed, by reason only of such selling, to be a person carrying on the trade of cowkeeper, dairyman, or purveyor of milk, and need not by reason thereof be registered.' One Christmas he fell ill with scarlet fever, and to while away the weary hours he occupied himself in bed by sending out his little bills to customers all round the place. While his hands were still peeling, the doctor who had been in attendance found him one day in the market-place, hail fellow with everyone he met, spreading infection everywhere. Not long after this the schools were closed. Several of the village children had died of scarlet fever, and the funerals were arranged and coffins supplied by the prosperous man of the place. When the first child died the simple folks were so deeply affected that all the rest of the school-children were bidden to the funeral, when white rosettes were handed out of the fever-stricken house for the small mourners to wear! A procession was then formed, and all proceeded to the church, where a service took place in front of the coffin. Next Sunday the church was crowded to hear the funeral oration, the dismal place unbearable from carbolic acid, which had been freely but vainly sprinkled about. Needless to say, the fever, the milk, the rosettes, and the coffin did their allotted work.

In the days of my youth there was a general idea that to send a sick or weakly child to a farm for a few weeks was the panacea for every ill. There were the warm milk fresh from the cow, the buttercups and daisies in the field, the simple life, a general kindliness and freedom. They were regarded as convalescent homes for town folk, but in those days no one knew the real cause of disease, nor whence it came; *it* could not be seen, from *it* we did not flee. The world was overpowered by the mysteries, and Fate kept on weaving her deadly spells.

In our hospitals, where Charity bid the sick and injured to come and be healed, hope gradually faded away and despair took up the cry, none knowing whence the stroke came. The mortality was frightful. Again, in our homes the angel of death hovered round every young mother at the moment her life was most needed, and none knew why joy should thus be turned into mourning.

Universities and schools of medicine were training medical men everywhere, the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons opened their portals to confer distinction on the highest, yet none knew or understood the true cause of disease. All was empirical. And while confusion and sorrow were pervading the world, Pasteur, then about thirty-three years of age, was pursuing his researches on ferments in a disused attic of the Ecole Normale, alone, under circumstances the most difficult. It was here he was enabled to dispel the mysteries by proving that the cause of disease in beer, wine, and in all putrescible material, including the human body, was due to the *vitality* of ferments and other disease-producing micro-organisms. The questions he had

to solve were 'Whence came those ferments, those microscopic bodies, those transforming agents, so weak in appearance, so powerful in reality?'[1] He found that when their work of transmutation was done, they died in common with all other living things in nature, leaving behind spores which were wafted about in the air, and hung on the walls around, ready to develop and spring into life once more on reaching a suitable soil. Thus slowly from the bare attic came the news which was destined in the course of time to reform medical and surgical practice, our hospitals, and our homes, through recognition of the principles and the introduction of cleanliness where formerly dirt, dust, and ignorance prevailed.

Since the days of the attic fifty years have come and gone. Pasteur, the great master, has found peace and rest in the most beautiful tomb the world has seen. It lies under the Institut Pasteur, the greatest living monument ever erected to living man, having been raised to him by all nations and endowed by generous gifts—more particularly that of Madame Hirsch—to carry on the work for ever. His disciple Lord Lister has just reached his eightieth year and lives still amongst us, though in honoured retirement. New generations have sprung into existence to find an enlightened world, a world into which they come whilst mothers sleep and dread not the dangers of five, three, even two decades ago.

With the key to knowledge in our hands the subject of health has taken a prominent place in the minds of all educated and thinking human beings, with the result that medical men have risen in public estimation, and that health societies have been established everywhere, forming as it were links between the great centres of research and the legislators of our country. Still, we have only to look at the farms all over Great Britain and Ireland to see for ourselves that they have never changed, and remain to-day what they have ever been, Acts of Parliament, orders, and regulations notwithstanding. We know that some model farms and model dairies exist, but when we consider that every house in the kingdom requires its complement of milk delivered daily, we have only to reflect in order to know that it must come from all quarters promiscuously. Owing to long-established custom we have come to regard our farmsteads as picturesque objects in the landscape planted there by Nature for artists to paint wherewithal to delight the eye; the pictures being handed down from generation to generation as works of art. But where Art is dumb, Science steps in behind those pastoral scenes, and tells the tale of cattle bred in disease, grazed on contaminated pastures, housed within walls saturated with centuries of disease-germs, denied the sunlight which might neutralise much, and condemned within these terrible walls to breathe air from the square into which all filth and infected excreta are thrown and collected to form 'plant-food' for the fields. The animals

[1] *Vie de Pasteur*, by Vallery Radot.

nurtured in these surroundings are driven from pillar to post all over the country to cattle-markets where they may or may not be sold, often spreading disease on the track and conveying disease to others. Some are bought by the butchers for human consumption, and have to run the gauntlet of inspection in our great cities at the abattoirs, but in little country districts escape from lawful supervision is not altogether impossible.

Others are bought for breeding purposes, and when calves are born they are usually separated from their mothers, who moan and weep as did Rachel for her children; but the farmer is inexorable: he has to make his profit out of the milk while it is plentiful, and the unhappy offspring have to endure semi-starvation on diluted or skim milk until turned into the fields to fend for themselves. In common with many human infants who are denied their mothers at this critical period of their lives, they simply scrape through to join the ranks of a deteriorated race, and give birth in due course to others. Thus history repeats itself, and yet all the while enlightened men are rising up amongst us to consider what can be done to save infant mortality, and improve the human race!

The subjects which at present command most serious attention are those of tuberculosis and the physical education and improvement of the people.

Since Professor Koch came over from Germany to address one of the general meetings of the International Congress on Tuberculosis held in London in the summer of 1901, with Lord Derby as President, public interest in that subject has increased; for, apart from its scientific importance, the statement he then made contained enough of the sensational element to attract the attention of the newspaper reader, and its far-reaching consequences affected all.

The occasion was a memorable one. St. James's Hall was packed with scientific men, society women, and women of societies, to hear the views of the man who was the first to discover, isolate, and cultivate the bacillus of tuberculosis. Anything that he might say carried a weight and an authority which no other name could give. Knowing this, Koch nevertheless maintained that bovine and human tuberculosis were different diseases, that the bacillus causing it in the one could not produce it in the other, except in an extremely mild and localised form, and that the danger of transmitting it from animals to human beings by means of meat or milk was practically non-existent. He based this opinion on the results of numerous experiments, and though he himself had no doubt on the matter, he rightly and properly insisted on the necessity of further experimental work being done on similar lines. To realise the revolution in ideas foreshadowed by Koch's words, it must be remembered that since his discovery of the tubercle bacillus no one doubted that it was the cause of the disease in all animals, and the identity of human and bovine tuberculosis was the

foundation on which rested innumerable orders, by-laws and regulations for the control of dairies and cowsheds, and the supply of meat and milk. Needless to say, the professor himself was listened to with the deepest respect, but his views on this particular point were received with grave doubt. Lord Lister immediately replied, and he and others showed clearly that it would require far more evidence than Koch produced to alter their belief that human and bovine tuberculosis were one and the same disease. But all agreed that such a statement could not be lightly ignored, and that its accuracy could only be proved or disproved by careful investigation and inquiry. The result was immediately felt by the arrest of the legislation contemplated by the Royal Commission which had been appointed to inquire into the 'Effect of food derived from tuberculous animals'; and, further, it had the effect of inspiring renewed interest and increased activity among bacteriologists all over the world in the study of the tubercle bacillus. It was hoped when Koch first produced tuberculin that it would arrest the progress of tuberculosis when injected into human beings; but although it seemed to have some effect in arresting lupus, it had to be abandoned as a remedy for pulmonary and other forms of human tuberculosis.

Private investigators, teachers in medical schools and veterinary colleges, and others interested chiefly in the scientific aspect of Koch's new theory commenced investigations and experiments more or less limited in scope. The Government, recognising the immense importance of it from an administrative and public health point of view and the many trade interests involved, within a short time appointed a new Royal Commission, to which it referred the solution of the problem as to whether tuberculosis was one and the same disease in animals and man, and the possibility of their being reciprocally infected with it. A third question put before them was to discover the conditions under which, if at all, the transmission from animals to man takes place.

Meanwhile many people engaged in one way or another in the milk and meat trades wished to take advantage at once of the statement made by Koch, and some agitation was started to obtain a relaxation of the regulations already in force intended in some slight manner to lessen the dangers hitherto supposed to exist from the consumption of tuberculous milk or meat. The Local Government Board therefore issued a circular to all local authorities, warning them that no alteration should be made in existing precautions, and in May 1904 the Commission presented a short interim Report, briefly stating that the results of their investigations up to that time tended to show that bovine tuberculosis could be conveyed to man. No details of the experiments were given, but were deferred, together with all discussions and arguments, to a future Report. The whole object of the Commissioners in issuing this Report was to point out

Uttarpara

that it would be clearly most unwise to frame or modify legislative measures in accordance with Koch's theory.

In the meantime various organisations instituted for the promotion of the health of the people and their education in the elements of sanitation were beginning to attach increasing importance to the question of the food supply. The publication of the unsavoury details of the Chicago meat scandals roused the general public to take an interest in the subject, and the time seemed favourable to commence an active campaign. The National Health Society, at the special wish of its President, Princess Christian, and under her personal direction, formed a committee to discuss the whole question of the food supply and the best means that could be adopted to improve it. The committee so instituted was in no sense a mere body of well-meaning amateurs. Its chairman was Sir Frederick Treves, and its members were all experts chosen on account of their special knowledge of the facts to be considered. Some were medical officers of health, experienced in the administration of the Public Health Acts; others were scientific men and bacteriologists to whom the diseases of animals, the impurities of food, and the dangers likely to arise from them were matters of daily concern.

At the first meeting, in which Princess Christian took an active part, general matters were discussed, and it was early realised that it would be impossible to deal at once with the whole of the many subjects covered by the term 'Food Supply.' It was agreed that the most urgent matter was the necessity of pure milk, and that the committee should begin by devoting the whole of its energies to this subject.

Another influential body, the National League for Physical Education and Improvement, working under Sir Lauder Brunton on somewhat similar lines, came to an almost similar conclusion, and eventually a joint committee was formed to act together and, by consulting the highest authorities, obtain the fullest information, and draw up a series of rules and regulations to form the basis of legislative measures for the improvement of the milk supply.

The recommendations of this joint committee will in due time be submitted to the Local Government Board, and the weight and authority of those responsible for them must undoubtedly ensure the most careful consideration of the Government. But it is also essential that the public should be roused to insist on new laws being passed to protect it from the dangers of impure milk. Those interested in the sale of such milk are loud in their denunciations of the exaggeration of the danger; while those who consume it seem content to remain silent, although exposed to risks for which remedies are yet to be found. If mothers, and those generally responsible for the welfare of the family, could only realise the difficulties in existing circumstances of getting the daily milk delivered into their homes

clean, free from dust, from pus, and other organic impurities, their present apathy would quickly be changed into a cry of self-defence. In recognition of this the Right Hon. John Burns, the President of the Local Government Board, has lately followed the example of private efforts and introduced a Bill authorising municipal milk depôts 'for the sale of milk *specially prepared for* consumption by infants under two years of age,' &c., &c. That the milk so sold is to be specially prepared, means, in other words, sterilised; that is to say, the living germs of possible and probable disease are to be devitalised. That is right in itself, but unfortunately, although boiling or sterilisation properly carried out will kill these germs, certain elements in the milk essential to the growth and vitality of the infant are also destroyed or altered in the process. No amount of scientific sterilising will make dirty milk clean in the ordinary non-scientific meaning of the word, nor will it remove those large particles of dust and dirt that can be detected in the last half-pint of milk in most churns and cans without the aid of any microscope. The intention is good, but the establishment of municipal milk depôts as *permanent* institutions is synonymous with giving a patient medicine to relieve his symptoms whilst allowing the real cause of his disease to continue. It seems beginning at the wrong end to burden the community with the cost of lessening danger arising from a condition caused by the neglect or ignorance of the individual.

Within the last few weeks the eagerly looked for Report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis has been issued. It was published, by a strange and pathetic coincidence, on the day of the funeral of the chairman of the Commission, Sir Michael Foster, and the words of the Report have thus an additional interest, for they are in a sense the final words of a great man of science who had devoted the last years of a brilliant life to the investigation of a question of the deepest moment to the public welfare. But, indeed, the gratitude of the country is due not only to Sir Michael Foster, but also to the other four members of the Commission who have for so long freely given their time and skill to the work; for it is a fact not generally known that members of temporary Royal Commissions receive no pay whatever for their services. In this particular case these services must have entailed greater sacrifices than usual on the Commissioners, for their own account of the manner in which they have pursued their inquiries shows that the investigation has been carried out on lines different from those usually adopted by Royal Commissions. No witnesses were examined, and the opinion expressed in the Report is based on no evidence except that of the experiments made in the Commission's own laboratories under its own direct supervision. Indeed, the work it has done has been simply an elaborate scientific research, conducted in laboratories installed by the nation and paid for by the Government. The precedent thus created by the

Commission should not be allowed to drop, for surely the results so far attained justify the establishment of a *permanent* place where the work of the Commission can be continued after it has issued its final Report and retired. Behind tuberculosis other questions still remain relating to diseases common to animals and man which affect the public health and can only be studied on a scale impossible for private enterprise, but trifling in cost when paid for by the Government for the good of the community. There is no such place in this country at the present time, and even this Tuberculosis Commission is indebted to private generosity for the opportunity of carrying out the work unhampered by want of space, and relieved of the necessity for considering such expensive items as rent, rates, and taxes, in their dealings with the Treasury. The introduction to the Report describes how the farms, the necessary lands for cattle, various buildings and laboratories, and even a house in addition, were handed over to the Commissioners by Sir James Blyth free of cost to the nation and without any conditions restricting their use. This action of Sir James Blyth, whose name is closely associated with the agricultural interests of the country, shows that he is one of those enlightened men who recognise the practical value of scientific research. Any detailed criticism of the Report would obviously be out of place here, but the simple language in which it is written and the clearness with which the arguments are set out make it easy to follow by the lay mind.

The tubercle bacillus is an organism, the Report tells us, capable of living not only within but also outside the animal body; it may be cultivated on various artificial media. Like other organisms, it exhibits certain morphological characters which may be observed by means of the microscope; it grows and multiplies in certain ways; and it possesses certain physiological properties, through which it acts upon, and is acted upon by, its environment, whether that environment be a living animal body or a lifeless artificial medium.

The artificial medium means serum obtained from different animals,[2] glycerine broth, glycerine agar (gelatine), glycerine potato, and other substances. The curious thing is that the bacillus taken from one of these sources will grow slowly and with difficulty, while the bacillus from another will grow with great readiness on the same medium.

The Commission carried out two parallel investigations at two entirely separate and distinct places—one on tuberculosis of bovine origin, and the other on tuberculosis from human sources. Each of these was studied from every aspect. The bacillus causing the disease in both was examined, first as to the effect it causes when inoculated into similar animals, and as to the manner in which it grows when

[2] Serum is blood which is allowed to stand still till the red part falls to the bottom, leaving a clear liquid above.

isolated and cultured outside the living body. The Commission found that the typical 'bovine' bacillus differed in certain respects from the typical 'human' bacillus, and could easily be recognised. Many different 'viruses' from bovine animals were examined, and it was found that they resembled each other in almost every respect. The human bacillus was isolated from many cases of tuberculous disease in all kinds and types of patients, and as a result the Commission has classed it in two groups. One of these is apparently the bacillus of human tuberculosis said by Koch to be an entirely separate and distinct organism. The other group is the vitally important point. The viruses included in it were obtained from cases of tuberculosis treated by operation, and in many instances from the bodies of patients who had died of the disease. The bacillus isolated from these viruses was found to be *identical with that found in naturally infected bovine animals.* In other words, the Commission has proved that severe and even fatal disease can be, and frequently is, caused in human beings by Koch's own so-called 'bovine' tubercle bacillus. The argument is strengthened by the statement in the Report that the cases of human tuberculosis examined were not selected with a view to obtaining only those most likely to have been infected from cows' milk, but were chosen as being representative of the various forms of the disease as generally seen both in children and adults. Under these circumstances the large proportion of cases in which it was found that human beings had been naturally infected with typical bovine tuberculosis becomes even more striking. Cows' milk containing bovine tubercle bacilli was found clearly a cause of tuberculosis, and of fatal tuberculosis, in man. The Commission further adds that milk coming from such cows ought not to form part of human food, and, indeed, ought not to be used as food at all. Results clearly point to the necessity of measures more stringent than those at present enforced being taken to prevent the sale and consumption of such milk.

This point is perhaps the most important in the Report, but many others not so directly connected with the food supply should be carefully considered by all in any way interested in questions of milk, dairies, and cowsheds.

The careful precautions adopted by the Commissioners to obtain only healthy cattle for their experiments show that they were fully aware of the enormous number of tuberculous animals in this country, and their statements as to the value of the tuberculin test as a means of diagnosis prove its reliability and importance.

It requires no great effort of imagination to see that within a short time the testing with tuberculin of all cows supplying milk will possibly be made compulsory by law, for the Commissioners insist that the proper carrying out of the test is essential to its accuracy. The means they adopted with their own animals are further detailed in the Report, and this is open to all.

To do any practical good we must go to the fountain head, the farm, and establish properly qualified veterinary surgeons to examine the cattle with tuberculin and separate the healthy from the unhealthy, and, further, to start fresh breeds in sound and sanitary conditions. Many experienced authorities are in favour of dispensing with byres and cowsheds, leaving the cattle to enjoy the privilege of open air summer and winter, day and night. Open sheds might be erected for shelter in bad weather, but if turned out in summer they soon become accustomed to the changes of season. In fact, one farmer who has already adopted the open-air treatment asserts that he has found no harm come even when a calf is born out in the field during pouring rain. It is found that the first year the cows give less milk, but subsequently, when nature has provided them with thicker coats, they bear the cold remarkably well, and yield more milk as they get hardier.

It is scarcely to be expected that the humble farmer could grapple with the intricacies of science, but it would be something gained if he were made to realise at last that cleanliness paid better than dirt, and that obedience to modern laws brought better returns and fewer losses than holding to the traditions of his forefathers and centuries of death-dealing ignorance.

ELIZA PRIESTLEY.

ORCHARD CITIES

The Gardenisation of England

One of the most significant signs of the times is the extraordinary rise in the value of land in Outer London during the past decade. The increase in the number of tubes and other forms of locomotion, combined with a steady rise of population, has been followed by a phenomenal appreciation in the value of metropolitan property. There can be no doubt that presently it will be impossible to secure at any reasonable price land within twenty-five miles of London Proper. Gardens and open spaces near the Metropolis are rapidly being swallowed up by miles of dreary streets. The result of this rise in land values has been a corresponding augmentation of rent, for high rentals invariably run parallel with dear land. And the end is not yet. The movement, the history of which I propose to summarise, may in one sense be considered as a protest against the dreadful monotony of suburban life with its stereotyped stock-brick or stucco villa and its eighty by fifteen feet patch of ground by courtesy called a garden. The movement so far has been on a small scale, but it has been singularly successful, and it may, I venture to think, be considered as the acorn from which great forests may yet spring.

Some years ago, when I was editor of the *Horticultural Times*, I contributed a paper to this Review dealing with 'The Fruit-Growing Revival,' in which I set forth, *inter alia*, a plan for cutting up land in small holdings for orchard purposes—in other words, of establishing a series of orchard cities. The seed fell on good soil, and as a result of that article the idea has been carried into practical effect. I propose as briefly as possible to set forth the manner in which these miniature cities adjacent to London have been founded, merely premising that I have no financial interest in the matter, and that this article is written with the desire to show that what has been done in a small way may be carried out for the public good on a more extensive scale. I believe that, when the value to the community at large of these fruit or orchard cities is understood and they are appreciated as they deserve, we shall see a new era in the gardenisation—to coin a word—not only of available land within twenty-five miles of London, but

within a reasonable range of every large city in the country. Fruit or orchard cities will meet the needs of the retired townsman who seeks the joys of country life without being cut off from easy access to the town and of the ever-increasing section of the community who desire to utilise week-end cottages not too far from their town residence. In my opinion, no practical orchard colony, to be permanently successful, should be more than twenty-five miles from a great city.

When it was decided to cut up an estate near London to start these cities the formula was an acre orchard, a well, and a glasshouse. There was to be no philanthropy in the matter, no sentiment, no appeals to the public or press; everything was to be run on strictly business lines. First, observe the amount of land. Surely, if a man goes from the town into the country he should have more than a city back garden; otherwise he suffers the inconvenience of rural life without its chief compensation. To attract the dusty-weary dweller in towns to the country we decided to offer him garden room enough and to spare. A 150 by 20 feet plot is totally insufficient—in fact, I contend that in the interests of health no one should be allowed to build a house anywhere with a garden less than double that size. The denizen of an orchard city not only wants to see his neighbours' grass and trees, but he demands, and with reason, grass and trees—or land on which he can grow them—for himself. Therefore, in the first place, we decided that those who people real garden or fruit cities should have at least an acre of land freehold apiece. In the next place, we arranged that they should not suffer building restrictions, or leasehold or manorial restraints. Their freeholds were to be freeholds in the widest and best sense of the term. A man who has an acre of land can, as a rule, build without depreciating his neighbour's property; given plenty of 'elbow space,' the very different style of house is a pleasing change; strikingly in contrast, moreover, with the hopeless uniformity of a London suburban street. It has now been demonstrated that a man or woman who is the proud possessor of an acre of freehold orchard will rise to the occasion, and, by hook or by crook, will erect thereon a residence worthy of the site. Neither of the two chief cities—the pioneers of orchard towns in this country—has a 'shanty' or jerry-built house upon it; on the contrary, most of the houses are artistic in design, and every one is built in the soundest possible way.

The Land, Trees, and Water of the Cities

The difficulty at the start was to get suitable land at a reasonable price for the undertaking. We were compelled to go to Essex, because in the first place land was cheaper, and in the next place railway fares and charges were more reasonable. As a fact, the railway season ticket to the nearest station for the chief of

the cities worked out at 7*d.* per day, whereas the same distance into Kent or Surrey would have been nearly double. So that until the companies reduce their fares orchard cities are blocked in the two last-named counties. We were willing to pay a high price for Kent or Surrey land, but the fares were too heavy to justify us attempting the experiment in any county but Essex. The sites of the cities were fortunate selections, at least in one respect, because we found water in abundance. A good supply of water is, as it were, the very life-blood of a good garden—especially at the start. We sank some forty wells, and in no case failed to secure a bountiful supply of the purest spring water at about 100 feet from the surface. After making a twelve-feet reservoir and lining it brick on edge, we bored until we found we had tapped the precious liquid. We then covered in the reservoir and fixed a pump. Consequently each purchaser of an orchard had a house site left vacant near the well, which could of course be piped into the house, his fencing completed, his orchard in order, even ornamental rose and flower beds prepared and planted, and a glasshouse filled with choice tomato-plants. The orchards were from one to three acres in extent and averaged about two acres. Each orchard had several hundred choice apple, pear, plum, and cherry trees, currant-bushes, &c., so that all that was left for the purchaser to do was to build his house, and then the thing was complete. The enterprise was to stand on its own bottom, and that is how it stands and stands well to-day. As soon as a purchaser completed his part of the bargain he was given possession, no extras of any kind, no legal costs, no valuation, even for the crop of tomatoes in the glasshouse, being charged. On the other hand, the promoters, who were necessarily large buyers, supplied, wherever possible, wood, seed, or anything else at wholesale prices. Benevolent neutrality on the part of the founders and absolute independence on the part of the orchardists were, in fact, the order of the day. Not only did we refrain from imposing building restriction, but we went farther—the buyer need not build at all! The price of the orchards was necessarily regulated by considerations of frontage and position, but generally speaking it averaged 100*l.* per acre freehold. An acre of land—43,560 square feet—with hundreds of choice fruit-trees, a well, a stocked tomato-house, a rose and flower bed, fenced and all complete, for 100*l.*, within twenty-two miles of the Metropolis—for 100*l.* is, it will be admitted, a very reasonable sum. I ask my readers to bear in mind that within a short radius of these fruit cities, under the small-plot system of which we hear so much, waterless, unfenced, bare land has realised at the rate of from 250*l.* to 600*l.* per acre. There are some things that need no comment; this is one of them.

The People of the Cities

These orchard cities were primarily intended for townsmen, and as a fact the bulk of the denizens of these miniature cities were drawn from the crowded streets of the Metropolis. All these places are within easy reach of a railway-station whence the fare to London is 2*s.* return, a season ticket working out, as I have said, at 7*d.* per day, about the fare that a suburban daily visitor to the City pays. Those who bought orchards and have built attractive houses thereon include all sorts and conditions of men and women; but the majority are Londoners. There is the retired tradesman with a sufficient reserve of cash to pass the rest of his days in comparative comfort, but who would be miserable if unoccupied; the man who has a business which in his absence may be safely entrusted to a manager; the retired Civil servant with a penchant for country life; the man—may his tribe increase!—who, though his means be scanty, has for compensation small needs and ambitions; the spinster sisters of good families—who does not know these in every village community?—who desire by the sale of eggs and garden produce to augment their limited income; the poultry-breeder whose soul delights in raising prize birds and who can give his two-legged kine plenty of elbow-room—one of the main secrets of success in poultry-rearing; the managing clerk whose hours of from ten till five enable him to have every day a few hours' pure country air—these are a few types of the dwellers in fruit cities. To all these life presents a wider meaning and infinitely more joyous aspect when they come from the mean, noisy, crowded streets into the fresh, open, and wholesome existence of the country, with its vast expanses of fields, abundant trees, towering hills, and their own, their very own, acre-orchard year by year increasing in productiveness and yielding ground rents in the best sense of the term. To the townsmen here, and here only, can be found the true *joie de vivre.*

The Houses of the Cities

I have said that the orchard-dwellers have demonstrated that if the average man can get hold of a decent piece of freehold land he will in some way or other erect thereon a suitable residence. When we cut up the estates that were to form the nucleus of these fruit cities I decided to impose, so far as the promoters were concerned, no building restrictions whatever, being confident that the buyers would strain every nerve to erect substantial and attractive houses thereon. The result exceeded my most sanguine anticipations. Almost every house is different from the other; there is no uniformity; each orchardist has carried out his own idea of what his residence should be. The outcome of this 'Liberty Hall' method of selling land is an utter absence of the dull and dreary uniformity that disfigures

suburban London streets. Unfortunately the local building regulations are very harassing, making no distinction between a house built in the midst of an acre or two-acre orchard and a residence in a crowded street. The folly of it! Despite all difficulties, however, the dwellers in the fruit cities have erected delightfully picturesque dwellings. Some have cost 200*l.*, others 1,000*l.* and upwards, but not one is of unsightly appearance. There is one thing against which I desire to lodge a public protest. I regret the absence of wooden houses, with their stout old beams, quaint gables, and picturesque old-world appearance, from our orchard cities. The present building regulations prohibit these. Why? The cost of a decent little concrete or brick bungalow of six rooms is from 200*l.* to 250*l.* Now consider: an equal sized pretty timber-house could be built complete for about 120*l.* If you come to think of it, a timber house, with its brick or timber foundations and chimneys, is in practice no more combustible, to say the least of it, than an ordinary brick or rough-cast house, with its lath-and-plaster partitions, its timber floors, joists, window-frames, doors, ceiling-laths, &c. At least twenty-five per cent. of so-called wooden houses are really composed of brickwork or concrete. The timber-built houses of old-world England are not only infinitely more picturesque, but much more substantial than the average modern brick-and-stucco 'villa residence.' What we have lost in quaintness and prettiness we have not gained in solidity or safety. The objection to a timber house in a street has some reason in it; but the objection as against a detached house in the centre of a field or orchard falls to the ground. What is needed is a sweeping modification of existing vexatious by-laws. No one sympathises less than I do with the jerry-builder and cheap-house speculator; but the by-laws, even when modified, will be sufficiently strong to cope with these gentry. Still, the fact remains that outside the towns houses cannot be built because of the cost involved by the present by-laws. Thousands of small houses are urgently needed in rural districts, but with these by-laws in force they do not pay to build. Again, estate owners cannot afford to erect houses for their labourers whilst these regulations remain unmodified; consequently the rents of houses already built remain too high, old unsanitary cottages are patched up, and those willing and able to do so are practically prohibited by these absurd rules, unintelligently carried out by rural councils, from building healthy and attractive houses. With the extension of suburban orchard cities, depend upon it, must come a revision of existing harsh building regulations.

The Fruit Cities of the Future

I venture to affirm that orchard cities can be almost indefinitely multiplied, and should encompass every large centre. What has been done in our miniature fruit cities can be carried out around any

provincial town of importance. Let me here answer a probable objection. Orchard cities are, it may be urged, for a special class. The average workaday man must live near his work, and factories and workshops are, as a rule, in towns. That is just where they should *not* be. With proper railway facilities there is absolutely no need for enormous factories in the centre of London. It is shocking to think of breweries covering an acre of land, pickle-factories, soap-refineries, potteries, &c., being planted in the heart of the Metropolis. Let them be transferred outside London Proper, and their workers will necessarily depart with them. Then, while the capital will be brighter, so will likewise the lives of the workers, who go out from the city both for their own and the city's good, unfortunately not always, as at these fruit cities, to get an acre of land, but, at any rate, a decent garden. That the idea is practical Bournville and Port Sunlight prove. But the fruit cities of the future must be on a more extensive scale than those with which I have been connected, which are mere miniature settlements. We can improve even on these cities in some respects. If I were laying down another estate in this way, I should give a glasshouse twice the size I did in those cities, even though I had consequently to plant perhaps fewer trees. I am inclined to think, further, that unless a man has all his time to attend to his garden, has plenty of sons and daughters, and is in the prime of life, with some previous experience of horticulture, an acre of land is as much as he can manage. The average of a couple of acres in the Essex cities was perhaps too much for a start. It is better to cultivate one acre well than to spread one's energies over too large a tract of land. The ordinary man of the townsman type will have in an acre of land, including a substantial well-stocked greenhouse, some fowls, his flower-beds, his roses, and his fruit-trees, as much as he can conveniently tackle unless he calls in extraneous aid. It is wonderful—it would, in truth, seem almost miraculous to the uninitiated—what intensive horticulture will produce from an acre of land. When this is realised we shall see orchard cities multiplied exceedingly. May I here venture a prophecy? Before many years we shall see electric or pneumatic Twopenny Tubes carrying people out a dozen miles at least, not only from every quarter of London, but from every large city. Then will be accomplished the long desired intercommunication 'twixt the crowded dusty streets and the perennially smiling fields—the greatly needed wedding of town and country. In that day the seed sown by these orchard towns will yield a great harvest for the public weal.

The subject of the establishment of these cities opens up very wide and far-reaching considerations in connection with the unemployed and land problem, upon which I have no space to dwell. I will therefore close with a summary of my views on this question generally.

(1) The establishment of fruit cities will have a valuable educational work in diffusing a knowledge of profitable horticulture. At present we import foreign fruit to the extent of many millions yearly. We could grow at least half of this in the United Kingdom. Orchard cities will be an important factor in this much needed consummation.

(2) Though it is unnecessary to discuss at length the profitable nature of scientific fruit-growing, or, in other words, making the most of the land, I may point out that a man who grows the right sorts of fruit, either in the open or under glass, and who knows how to pick and market that fruit, can always command a substantial income in this country. Fruit-growing is the most profitable method of cropping the soil. With the spread of orchard cities and the gardenisation of England will come a diffusion of this valuable knowledge amongst the people. These cities, primarily intended for townsmen and 'week-enders,' will lead to the establishment of similar settlements on a much more extensive scale for those embarking in fruit-growing purely for profit. The one is the complement of the other.

(3) In the United States, Canada, and the Australian colonies more scientific study and official encouragement in commercial horticulture are given than at home—a state of things which will be remedied as soon as other cities of the orchard city type are organised. Amongst the things needed to be taught are: how to deal with insect pests; what sorts of fruits flourish best in particular soils and localities; how to plant, prune, bud, and graft; what varieties to grow; how to pack and market; the value of cold storage—almost unknown in England at present; culture under glass; and a hundred other points all vital in commercial horticulture. But the chief and foremost point needed to be inculcated is this: that we can only effectually meet foreign competition by growing choice fruit; and that, for example, a Cox's orange pippin or a Worcester Pearmain apple tree occupies no more space than a common sort.

(4) The institution of these cities must necessarily lead to legislation simplifying our land-tenure system. The cost of land transfer must be cheapened, and facilities given for the acquirement of land for the purposes of fruit-growing, so that large tracts now lying practically waste can be utilised in this way for the public weal. The English horticulturist or farmer should be given the same facilities as the Irish tenant to acquire at a fair valuation the fee-simple of the land he cultivates.

(5) The soil of Ireland being as a whole, and particularly in the south, adapted for fruit-growing, as I have shown elsewhere, thousands of acres of apple, pear, plum, and cherry orchards should be laid down there (in place of the people continuing to grow coarse potatoes and other unprofitable crops), through the medium of orchard cities, so as to meet the existing demand and to divert into the pockets of the Irish

landholders a portion of the enormous sums now paid to continental, colonial, and transatlantic growers.

(6) Fruit cities, amateur and professional, when in full working order, will not only draw thousands of townsmen back to the land, but will help to materially decrease the number of physically fit unemployed.

(7) The establishment of these cities for townsmen to fill up their leisure amid rural surroundings will necessarily be followed by similar settlements for those desiring to live entirely from the raising of garden produce. The cry of 'Back to the land' is utterly futile until the people are taught how to utilise that land to the best advantage. Orchard cities even for townsmen will have a marked educational effect in this direction.

(8) Were one hundred thousand acres of land near large centres in the United Kingdom, now lying idle and unproductive, laid down to acre-orchards on the plan adopted in the orchard cities, town dwellers would gladly flock to settle down in them, thus relieving the congestion of the towns and improving the health and comfort of both the people who go out and those who remain in the city.

(9) Orchard cities, small or great, amateur or professional, open up enormous potentialities for the utilisation of women's work. There is a great opening for the utilisation of 'the art that doth mend nature' by women in fruit and flower growing. The minute care and attention needed for success in horticulture bring out the special qualities of the weaker sex, whilst the physical labour is not so heavy as with typewriting, telegraphy, sewing, cigarette-making, and other departments of women's work, and it is infinitely more healthy.

(10) Finally, the establishment and development of orchard cities will help us to meet the ever-increasing demand on the part of the people for choice fruit, to adequately supply which we now pay 11,000,000*l.* annually to the foreign grower.

FRANK ALTON MORGAN.

THE WANDERING JEW

At the beginning of the seventeenth century a book appeared with the following title: 'A brief description and tale of a Jew by name *Ahasuerus*, who was present in person at the Crucifixion of Christ, who moreover shouted with the rest the "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" and instead of desiring His acquittal, desired that of Barabbas, the murderer; but after the Crucifixion was never able to return to Jerusalem, also never saw his wife and children again, has remained alive ever since, and came to Hamburg a few years ago, &c.'[1]

The contents of the book, which bears the date 1602, may be briefly stated thus:

Paul von Eitzen, Doctor in the Holy Scriptures, and Bishop of Schleswig, who is respected by all, and considered to be a teller of the truth, told this to me and to other students very often:

Once, when during my student days in the winter of 1542, I went to visit my parents at Hamburg, I saw the next Sunday in church during the sermon, a very tall man standing opposite the pulpit; he was barefoot, and his hair hung down over his shoulders. The man listened to the sermon with such attention that he stood there perfectly still and stiff, but every time the name of Jesus Christ was mentioned, he bowed, beat his breast, and gave a deep sigh. In conversations which I had with the man later, he informed me that he had been in Jerusalem at the time of Christ, had helped towards His condemnation, and on His last sorrowful journey had repulsed Him from his house with rough words. Thereupon Jesus had looked hard at him, and said: 'I shall stand here and rest, but you shall wander forth and be everlastingly restless.' Then he saw Jesus die on the Cross, but could not possibly return to his people in the town of Jerusalem; ever since he had been a wanderer on the face of the earth, and longed for death. The same man was also seen in the town of Danzig shortly before 1602.

Is this to be regarded as a legend or a myth? These two terms have of late been greatly confused. Originally they were quite distinct. A legend denotes a tale connected with an actual event

[1] The German title runs: 'Kurze Beschreibung und Erzählung von einem Juden mit Namen *Ahasverus*, welcher bei der Kreuzigung Christi selbst persönlich dabeigewesen ist, auch das *Kreuzige, kreuzige ihn!* über Christus mitgeschrieen, und statt seiner Freisprechung die des Mörders Barrabas gewünscht hat, aber nach Christi Kreuzigung nicht mehr nach Jerusalem hat kommen können, auch sein Weib und Kinder nicht mehr gesehen hat und seitdem am Leben geblieben ist, vor etlichen Jahren nach Hamburg gekommen ist, u.s.w.'

or locality, concerning something of importance which had a real existence. It easily becomes amplified, and possibly later embodies an idea, a tendency, or a warning. The myth, on the contrary, is a tale in which at its very outset an idea is illustrated or personified. It would be well if this distinction was always adhered to; for the question is whether the tale about Ahasuerus was connected with an actual event, or arose from probably an unconscious impulse to give concrete form to an idea.

It is not so easy to answer this question. If the tale be considered to be a legend, the narrative has been supposed to have been made up from other narratives earlier in circulation.

Thus, Roger of Wendover (died 1237), a monk of the English abbey of St. Albans, relates the following in his chronicle, under the year 1228:

In this year a certain Archbishop of Armenia Major came on a pilgrimage to England, to see the relics of the saints and visit the sacred places in this kingdom, as he had done in others; he also produced letters of recommendation from his Holiness the Pope to the religious men and prelates of the churches, in which they were enjoined to receive and entertain him with due reverence and honour. On his arrival he went to St. Albans, where he was received with all respect by the abbot and monks; at this place, being fatigued with his journey, he remained some days to rest himself and his followers, and a conversation was commenced between him and the inhabitants of the convent by means of their interpreters, during which he made many inquiries concerning the religion and religious observances of this country, and related many strange things concerning eastern countries. In the course of conversation he was asked whether he had ever seen or heard anything of Joseph, a man of whom there was much talk in the world, who, when our Lord suffered, was present and spoke to Him, and who is still alive in evidence of the Christian faith; in reply to which a knight in his retinue, who was his interpreter, replied, speaking in French, 'My Lord well knows that man, and a little before he took his journey to the western countries, the said Joseph ate at the table of my lord the Archbishop in Armenia, and he had often seen and held converse with him.' He was then asked about what had passed between Christ and the same Joseph, to which he replied, 'At the time of the suffering of Jesus Christ, he was seized by the Jews and led into the hall of judgment, before Pilate the governor, that he might be judged by him on the accusation of the Jews; and Pilate finding no cause for adjudging him to death, said to them: 'Take him and judge him according to your law;' the shouts of the Jews, however, increasing, he, at their request, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus to them to be crucified. When, therefore, the Jews were dragging Jesus forth, and had reached the door, Cartaphilus, a porter of the hall in Pilate's service, as Jesus was going out of the door, impiously struck Him on the back with his hand, and said in mockery, 'Go quicker, Jesus, go quicker; why do you loiter?' And Jesus, looking back on him, with a severe countenance said to him, 'I am going, and you will wait till I return.' And according as our Lord said, this Cartaphilus is still awaiting His return; at the time of our Lord's suffering he was thirty years old, and when he attains the age of a hundred years he always returns to the same age as he was when our Lord suffered. After Christ's death, when the Catholic faith gained ground, this Cartaphilus was baptised by Ananias (who also baptised the Apostle Paul), and was called Joseph. He often dwells in both divisions of Armenia and other eastern countries, passing his time amidst the bishops and other prelates of the

Church; he is a man of holy conversation and religious, a man of few words and circumspect in his behaviour, for he does not speak at all unless when questioned by the bishops and religious men; and then he tells of the events of old times, and of the events which occurred at the suffering and resurrection of our Lord, &c.

In L. Neubaur's excellent book, *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden* (Leipzig, 1884, p. 6), Cartaphilus is mentioned as 'the prototype of the Wandering Jew.' But the reader cannot fail to perceive the great differences between the two figures. The first part of the word Cartaphilus, according to Neubaur, resembles the Greek *κάρτα* 'very,' so that the name signifies 'very much loved,' and reminds one of John, the 'disciple whom Jesus loved,' of whom it was supposed that he will remain alive until the second advent of Christ. But the individual in the other story bore the name Ahasuerus. The one was a doorkeeper, the other a shoemaker.

Of course, the same person could easily combine the post of doorkeeper with the trade of a shoemaker. But the one is represented as a Christian who received the name of Joseph, while the other remained a Jew and was called Ahasuerus. Moreover, it is important to note that no credible testimony of the life of the legend about Cartaphilus-Joseph can be traced in the sixteenth century (Neubaur, p. 12). The narrative of Ahasuerus, printed in 1602, makes no reference to earlier statements. An edition printed at Danzig, however, has a statement on its title-page that the same Jew was named earlier by an Italian author Johannes Buttadeus. The first part of that name was probably derived from the Italian *buttare*, to *thrust out*, and therefore may signify a fighter against God, an aggressor of Christ. In the narrative of 1602, however, there is no mention of a blow given by Ahasuerus to Jesus. The identity of Cartaphilus and Ahasuerus was questioned by Lessing in a letter to his brother, and I am myself of opinion that the absolute independence which clothes the Ahasuerus figure of the 1602 narrative renders it scarcely possible to suppose that it was evolved from earlier fables.

Is, then, the 1602 narrative a myth?

The idea that the Jewish people were, soon after the Crucifixion (and, indeed, as a result of that event), driven from their homes, to become wanderers on the face of the earth, may easily have been crystallised into a concrete tale. The significant words of the bearer of the cross to the women of Jerusalem, 'Do not lament for Me; lament for yourselves and for your children,' might easily be developed into a tale of the miserable fate of one native of Jerusalem, as the representative of the people of Jerusalem. We should then have before us the material husk of a truth equally concerned with the history of religion and of civilisation.

If the tale be regarded as a myth, the name 'Ahasuerus' appears, however, at a first glance, to present an insurmountable obstacle. It is so rare that it is unlikely to have been invented. It occurs only

Day of Judgment and the end of the world were at hand. With that particular time, according to the ancient Christian expectation, a turning-point in the fate of Israel was combined (Rom. xi. 25 ff.). Who can assert that in such times, and in some Israelitish hearts, it was impossible a powerful longing may not have awakened for deliverance from the burdensome oppression of Israel which had lasted through so many centuries? May not the desire have become implanted in the hearts of some that the long-lasting national misfortune might be removed if the jarring relations of Israel to Jesus underwent a change? Who can deny that the thought may have struck this or that wandering Jew that the contemporaries of Jesus had meted out to him too much cruelty and pitilessness?

This cannot be proved impossible. Thus the origin of the Ahasuerus figure of the 1602 book may be found in the history of civilisation, and becomes psychologically comprehensible. I am the more inclined to that view since the recently completed *Jewish Encyclopædia* gives no historical explanation of the figure. In the last volume (vol. xii. p. 462) the 'Wandering Jew' is merely described as an 'imaginary figure of a Jerusalem shoemaker,' and the very questionable idea is put forward that the upholding of the existence of the Wandering Jew was eagerly favoured by the Reformation because he was regarded as an eyewitness of the death of Jesus Christ. But was fresh testimony to that fact necessary, and were not similar tales spread abroad, both before and after the Reformation, by other Christians? [4]

Having attempted to describe the historical source of the Ahasuerus figure, I will now turn to the second province in which the figure has played a part—the province of literature. Let us see what fate befell the Ahasuerus figure in its literary treatment, after it had gained a place in the history of ideas. But as I am less acquainted with the representations of the figure in English literature, I shall confine myself in this part of my survey to the main points of the direction followed.

Together with such research, it is of interest to inquire how the Jewish intellectual world stands in regard to the theme. It is self-evident that the genesis of the myth—if the above decision be admitted—can scarcely redound to the positive greatness of the Jews. But how has Jewish intellect regarded the subject when it entered into the consciousness of the civilised world?

In order to judge this point, let us look at the one-act play *Ahasver*, which the Dutch author Heijermans wrote in 1893. The setting is a Russian persecution of the Jews. The grandfather of the family in question has already fallen a victim to it. When the storm of persecu-

[4] The English expression, 'the wandering Jew,' and the French expression, 'le Juif errant,' are more correct than the German, 'der ewige Jude,' *the eternal Jew*; and it is not employed in the 1602 book. It occurs first in an impression of 1694.

tion bursts forth afresh, the only son of the house turns Christian. The Cossacks inform the father. He hurls violent curses at his son, and, accompanied by his wife, takes to flight, while the son breaks down under the weight of the curses. Here, a Jew who sends his baptised son to hell, and betakes himself to homeless wandering, is termed a modern Ahasuerus. What strong partisanship is revealed in such a presentation! It can only be explained by the justifiable indignation at the violence of a Russian persecution of the Jews. But it cannot thereby be excused. The father who cursed his son because he turned Christian ought not to be called Ahasuerus. For although the Ahasuerus of the old tale practised cruelty towards Jesus, Jesus did not abuse him, but bore His terrible sufferings in silence.

Similarly a purely Jewish spirit permeates *The Wandering Jew* of Robert Buchanan (1893), who has ventured to represent Christ as Ahasuerus. He sets Christ on a mountain confronting humanity, which comes forward as His accuser and judge. And why? He has not given peace to mankind; He has taken peace from them. How does the author come to make such an assertion? Quite simply. The sufferings which have been brought on humanity through the struggles of selfish men against Christ and His religion of self-sacrifice —the author numbers amongst those sufferings the war against the Turks—those sufferings are in Buchanan's poem stated to be Christ's fault. It was not enough that His noble religious and moral work should be once misjudged. He must be condemned and tortured a second time.

A connecting link between works written from the Jewish point of view about Ahasuerus and a second group of representations of the subject may be found in Berthold Auerbach's novel, *Spinoza*. For he puts in the mouth of the wanderer, whose tears had been dried by time, the following reason for his hatred towards Jesus: 'We loved the earth, and He showed us the heavens; we wished for a sword, and He taught us to love the foreign yoke; He was not our Messiah.' Auerbach shows no trace of comprehension of the aim of Jesus as it appears in the history of religion. He desired to perfect the prophetical perspective according to the inner organic law of its being. Just as the majority of Christ's contemporaries failed to recognise His mission, so did Auerbach. On the other hand, Auerbach causes Spinoza, the Pantheist, with whom God is the Universe, to be thus apostrophised by his Ahasuerus, 'Thou art come to be a Saviour to mankind, me too thou wilt save.' And then he makes Ahasuerus bend over the sleeping philosopher and kiss him. The caress redeems the wanderer, 'who bore on himself the doom of Israel.'

This presentment of the Ahasuerus figure is made up of two ingredients — of the dregs of the Jewish ideas of the future, and of the froth of a pantheistic philosophical view of the world.

I purposely mention the dregs of the Israelitish ideas of the future. For Judaism itself is not satisfied with Auerbach's description of the Messianic ideal. Materialistic and political blessings cannot, for the spirit of Judaism which desires to remain true to itself, form the only or the highest factors of its strivings towards a future. And Spinoza 'led Judaism to philosophical liberty.' Thus does Th. Kappstein express himself, who (in his recently published book, *Ahasver in der Weltliteratur*) sets forth a chronological list of modern works on the subject. It is to be hoped that in the people of Israel there are many souls who eagerly desire to be freed from the burden of the consciousness of guilt through a suffering representative of Israel, in the manner of the lamb who was led to the sacrifice, and whose voice was not uplifted.

Like Auerbach, but without his outspoken inclination to the Jewish point of view, a second group of modern workers of the Ahasuerus theme have seen in it the representative of a new philosophy.

Carmen Sylva (Elizabeth, Queen of Roumania), in her poem *Jehova* (1882), makes her Ahasuerus burst out into the following words at the sight of a pair of lovers :

> I have loved goodness, I have served goodness—throughout my wandering !—
> In the desert, in the snowstorm, in the ocean I sought God.—
> I sought him in my own breast : sorrow filled my cup.
> But now my eyes see : God is in ' becoming,' God is an eternal ' becoming.'

This is not the place to criticise the particular idea expressed in those words. The tendency to make the Ahasuerus figure the bringer-in of Pantheism, of the apotheosis of the universe, is fairly powerfully bound up with the figure. For even if we merely take into account the long-lasting restless wandering, that characteristic is but a faint reflex of all the alleged vicissitudes of the surviving pantheistic processes of the universe.

It is easier to represent Ahasuerus as the prophet of an inspired pessimistic view of the universe and of life. That has actually been done several times.

In Edgar Quinet's *Ahasvérus* (1833), Ahasuerus is represented as a man who has himself been pursued by misfortune ; whithersoever he turned misfortune was always in his train. Death and love fight for his soul : Death in the form of an old woman who dwells by the Rhine, Love in the form of Rachel, an angel, whose tears of compassion for Ahasuerus had caused the gates of the Holy City to be closed against her, and who now acts as Death's servant. By the side of this woman Ahasuerus continues to fulfil his mission of collecting all the sorrow of the earth ; and even the redemption which *Quinet permits him to find in the woman's love is only an ephemeral* episode in the gloomy world-drama which is to conclude with a general crash. It is, in fact, an image of the barrenness of spirit of the unhappy

poet himself, who, after he had lost his belief in religion, wandered over Europe and Asia, but found himself everywhere confronted with hollow-eyed ruins.

Others went even farther in the mistaken desire of bringing into the foreground only one side of Ahasuerus's fate. According to Th. Kappstein's book, already referred to, 'the kernel of the legend' was revealed when it was developed 'into a poem of the blessing of death' (p. 94). But then the fading of a leaf becomes the 'kernel' of the tree.

While those who describe Ahasuerus as a pessimist declare his fate to be merely the result of his conduct, others analyse the motive of his acts, in order to represent him from that time forward as the herald of a new philosophy of life. This is what F. Lienhard does in his *Ahasver* (1901). He makes him discard a sort of religious materialism for a natural philosophy of falsely generalising deduction, and so represents Ahasuerus as a powerful, striving fighter for materialism.

A third group of authors imagine they see in Ahasuerus a representative of the idea of evolution, which is either mere formal greatness or mere formal strength. The following offer examples of that point of view.

In the three parts of his *Ahasver* (1865–68), S. Heller describes a spirit which during its wandering and development enters the *clientèle* of its 'brother-legend' 'Faust,' and imagines he recognises, in the age of the invention of printing, of the discoveries of new lands, of the Reformation, and of the worship of free humanity, the last and loftiest religion. Yet it is an abuse of the Ahasuerus figure if a chameleon *rôle* is assigned to it. If Heller leads Ahasuerus through the Reformation to the worship of free humanity, the Reformation is then cut off from its positive source; and to those who know history will occur the words of Goethe's *Faust*: 'What is called the spirit of the age is your own spirit, in which the age is reflected.'

So Ahasuerus has often, and in modern times, been represented as the prototype of an impetuous fighter. He is taken from the sphere of negative opposition and placed in that of positive struggle. He has also been represented as the embodiment of the Prometheus idea, as in J. G. Fischer's *Der ewige Jude* (1854) Fischer regards Ahasuerus as the representative of struggling humanity. Alluding to the Prometheus myth, he ventures to say of himself and his relations with mankind:

> Yes, chain me to the rocky wall—
> I still remain a free man,
> I alone can redeem thy colossal ignorance,
> I, with creative brain and the divine ether beam,
> With the bold brow of thought,
> Stole fire from Heaven.

There is some truth in what J. Prost [5] observes: 'The metaphysical

[5] *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden in der neuern deutschen Literatur*, 1905.

ideas of mortality and immortality, of finite and infinite, must challenge the ingenuity of the poet and urge him to descend into the deepest depths, and to clothe the history of the Universe and of nations with the imaginative enchantment of poetry.' But much of what modern authors have attributed to the Ahasuerus figure is not suited to its nature. Goethe had so much historical sense that he recognised the primitive character of the Ahasuerus figure, and wished to retain it, although in many variations. Prost, on the basis of careful research of some material left by Goethe, comes to the conclusion that 'For Goethe, the legend belonged to the region of religion and church, and revolved round the ideas of cursing, repentance, perdition, redemption, round the contrast between Judaism and Christianity' (p. 16). In later times other minds are not to seek which preserve the religious and historical point of view which was formerly comprised in the idea of the Wandering Jew.

To this fourth group of modern authors who have carefully examined the religious origin of the Ahasuerus idea belongs Wilhelm Hauff. He writes in his *Memoiren des Satan*,[6] 'The legend contains a deep moral, for the most abandoned of men is evidently he who vents his sorrow over his disappointed hopes on him who raised those hopes.' Historical truth is surely disregarded here, if it is meant that Jesus roused expectations of political and material well-being. Many of His contemporaries cherished such expectations, however much Jesus demonstrated the spiritual character of the true salvation of men which His real pioneer in the history of religion had already pointed out.

Schubart, in his well-known poem, *Der ewige Jude* (1783), has treated the Ahasuerus figure from the correct religious and historical point of view. The accuracy of his representation is not to be questioned because he throws his Ahasuerus from Mount Carmel into the sea, and causes him to be put to rest by an angel. For he is only to be regarded as a sleeper who is to be wrapped in unconsciousness until the Day of Judgment.

Among the later authors who have treated Ahasuerus from the correct historical standpoint we may note two, the French author Eugène Sue and the German author Gustav Renner.

The strong contrast between the indescribable suffering of Jesus and the cruel pitilessness practised by Ahasuerus has often of late been the point in his career on which men's judgment of Ahasuerus rests. Eugène Sue brings this out in his voluminous novel, *Le Juif errant*, and attempts to explain his conduct. His idea is that on a certain day the bearer of the cross went past the house of Ahasuerus when he was sitting at his work, filled with anxiety and hatred because, notwithstanding the hardest toil on his part, he could not keep bitter want from his family. Suffering himself, he refused pity to the

[6] Hempel'sche edition, p. 59.

Sufferer. Such an explanation is unsatisfying. For the two cases of suffering cannot be compared either in kind or measure. The unpleasant taste left by the driving away of the bearer of the cross, who sets down His load for a moment, cannot possibly be removed in that way.

Gustav Renner has recently shown a specially acute feeling for the delicate contrast between the outward striving on the one side and the inward need on the other, which forms the main point of Christ's life-work. He puts it forward in his striking poem, *Ahasver* (1902), admirable for its skilful form, and even more for its choice imagery. He rightly takes the self-denial of Jesus, who turns aside His eyes from earthly splendour, and draws back His hand from worldly power, as the central point of his production. In those traits of the Master of masters he found the typical guidance for the most valuable achievement of the Man, and therefore announces as the loftiest standard for the Day of Judgment:

> Only he who has forsaken himself
> Will find himself for ever;
> He whom no bond fetters,
> He will be bound for ever.
> Only he who conquers himself
> Will be freed from his own will:
> He has conquered the world
> And it is his.

And, as Renner's *Ahasver* acknowledges at last:

> What offered me hope vanished like froth,
> Death became life, and life death;

so should I like, at the conclusion of this critical wandering on Ahasuerus's track, to express the two following reasons for my conviction, reasons which I have always found particularly consoling. On the one side, an historical and academic judgment on Christianity will not regard the verdict on the Ahasuerus figure as the last and only right verdict; and on the other, I should be greatly in error if I believed that the spirit of Judaism will always estimate the perfection to be hoped for in the future after this earthly fashion. Therefore the study of these ideas about Ahasuerus has always inclined me to think that a reconciling influence may lie in the Ahasuerus figure itself.

EDUARD KÖNIG.

REVIEWERS AND REVIEWED

THE NEW CULTURE

WHEN, after three years of arduous labour and research, Mr. Peter Brown, a middle-aged gentleman of retired habits and scholarly tastes, published his biographical *magnum opus*, *John Philips: the Cider Poet and his Age*, he awaited its reception by the critical Press with the usual emotions of his kind. Why he should have selected for resuscitation the seventeenth-century bard of bibulous memory (or of bibulous suggestion, for the author of the effusion entitled *Cyder* seems to have been reasonably sober for his time, though much addicted to tobacco) cannot easily be understood; but he doubtless obeyed some mysterious mandate of the *Zeitgeist*. It is enough to say that the volume, whose appearance had been timed with psychological nicety by his publishers, came into his hands a thing of beauty and joy, of copious margins and enviable binding, and of definite and irreducible price—to be exact, 13*s*. 4*d*. net. Mention should also be made of the illustrations: every procurable likeness of the poet, his family, friends and connections, and every extant title-page of his works, had been reproduced by the best modern methods; while the resources of photography had been drained in supplying views of the places upon which he may be said to have impinged in the course of his short and harmless career. It was, in brief, a plum for the connoisseur in fine books; but what chiefly gratified him was its revelation of the unsuspected charms of his own literary style. What had seemed weak and turgid in manuscript, and at the best mediocre in proof, shone forth in the finished page a marvel of concisely brilliant statement and happily balanced phrase; and he perceived, with tremors of pleasure in his quiet and somewhat sensitive soul, that he was indeed a Classic, though a modest one.

Another cause for self-gratulation was the fact that his lines had not fallen in the age of the truculent reviewer, of the bludgeon, pickaxe, and crowbar, so to speak. On the contrary, he believed the critics of his time to be an erudite and discerning body of men, ready to praise, eager to detect merit in form or matter, and especially anxious to welcome a stylist of his peculiar and delicate powers. To reassure

himself, however (for he lived in the depths of the country, and his recent immersion in cider had somewhat withdrawn him from current affairs), he wrote to his old college friend Gray, who was himself an author and journalist in the British capital.

His answer was in every respect satisfactory.

The reviewer of to-day [said his friend] is, as you surmise, a totally different being from the slaughterous animal of the past, and is, indeed, if I may use the language of one of my brothers of the pen, 'a God-fearing man of letters,' more anxious to discover good than to expose evil in the works submitted to his judgment. Many of them, like myself, are authors as well as critics; and the desire to do unto others as they would themselves be done by, is ever in their minds. They are, moreover, keenly sensitive to literary form, avid for bright and original ideas, and on the pounce, so to say, for felicities of diction. Therefore you may feel confident, if your work possesses the qualities foreshadowed by your early efforts when we were together at St. Swithin's, that they will be recognised and proclaimed. As an intermediary between the author and his future readers (and purchasers) the modern review, indeed, leaves nothing to be desired. Revealing by deft selection aided by judicious comment the exact nature of the book, whetting but not satisfying the peruser's appetite, and covertly suggesting the vaster stores from which its samples have been culled, its influence on the author's reputation and pocket cannot be overestimated. That the Press has, in late years, undergone a certain democratising process, you are perhaps aware; and the signed critique has doubtless penetrated even to your bucolic solitudes; but if you should have the luck to be personally conducted in this way by one of our younger lions, your fame and fortune would be secured.

Yes, my dear Brown [the letter concluded], you may dismiss all concern about your treatment by the Press. The old self-seeking, self-advertising reviewer, who made himself famous or infamous at the author's expense, is as dead as the knights of the cudgel and slime-pot who killed John Keats and besmeared Coventry Patmore. We have changed all that, and a good many things besides; but perhaps the greatest innovation of the age is the new creative criticism. The old critic was merely an artizan: the new critic is an artist. You give him your book—put it in the slot as it were—and he does all the rest; he creates your atmosphere, he creates your public, and he creates *you*.

Mr. Brown smiled. He was, of course, gratified at the prospect held out before him; but a vivid recollection of his friend's somewhat ebullient temperament in his youth caused him to accept his assertions with several spoonfuls of salt. 'The millennium can hardly have come yet, even in journalism,' he said. 'But we shall see,' he added, and proceeded to engage the services of a well-known agency for supplying authors with the unbiased opinions of their fellow-scribes upon themselves and their literary wares. Wishing, however, to see the relative prominence given to his work as compared with that of his more noted rivals, he stipulated that the different papers should be sent him uncut, enclosing larger fees for the purpose. Then, leaving his cause to his self-appointed champions, he resumed the duties of a country landowner and justice of the peace, with a placid though expectant mind.

The signal that, for the first time in his life, he had left the by-lane

of anonymity for the high-road of signed publication, was conveyed to him by a copy of *The Proletarian*, which he found on his library table after one of his judicial jaunts. For a moment the dread of seeing his name in the cold malignity of print stayed his hand; then, bracing himself for the ordeal, he burst open the wrapper. It was his first contact with journals of the kind; and his eye wandered in bewilderment over vague and misty photographs of men and women—admirals and actresses, cabinet ministers, newly engaged or wedded couples, and lately cured victims of gout or influenza—until the object of his quest was revealed. On the first page apparently that could be spared from the requirements of news and other information (chopped into small mouthfuls as if for infant consumption) he beheld a whole column headed 'Cider.' But the discovery was attended with a shock; for, under the double-depth caption and in equally heavy type, were the words, 'By Ben Bonsor'! A momentary conviction that, all unknown to him, another person had been engaged on his task, and had here forestalled him, took possession of his mind; but closer scrutiny discovered a small, badly blurred line between the heading and the text, announcing '*The Cider Poet and his Age.* By P. Brown. Gabbitas & Groves. 13*s.* 4*d.* net.' Angry though he was at the optical deception, he began to read with eagerness. At the outset he was relieved to find that the subject was entirely congenial to Mr. Bonsor's mind; it seemed, indeed, to affect him much as the beverage itself might have done. He waxed facetious, as if the whole thing were a joke; he drew pictures of West Country apple-orchards, with bands of idyllic youths and maidens gathering the ruddy fruit to the accompaniment of laughter, song, and an occasional dance; and in describing the operations of extracting the precious juice, he positively smacked his lips! It was not until half-way down the column that the Cider Poet himself made his entry; and here the fact that his father and grandfather were both ecclesiastical dignitaries called forth a long diversion on the historical connection between the Church and the public-house. After this the poet's history was resumed, and Mr. Brown experienced another shock of surprise at the writer's familiarity with the theme; he seemed to have lived with the Christ Church student and his museful outpourings from his earliest infancy. 'Every schoolboy knows' was in effect his comment on the painfully acquired and carefully presented information which had cost Mr. Brown three of the most laborious years of his life. He quoted jauntily from the poet's verse, but never from Mr. Brown himself, although freely paraphrasing his most acute remarks; and at the end his hilarity again overcame him.

It is refreshing, in this dry and thirsty weather [he wrote], to stumble on a subject at once so moist and so exhilarating as cider. We have to thank Mr. Blenkinsop—no, Mr. Brown (we beg his pardon, we have just reviewed *Blenkinsop on Bees*)—for enabling us to bring this cooling beverage before the British

public, who will doubtless make its acquaintance, if they have not already done so, with their usual promptness.

Hot with resentment, Mr. Brown wrote to his London friend, commenting in unmeasured terms on the manners and morals of the 'God-fearing men of letters' to whom the task of reviewing the literature of the age was entrusted. 'He has merely written a dithyrambic screed on cider,' he said, 'with a few of my carefully gathered facts thrown in as ballast, and has no more reviewed my book than he has squared the circle.' Mr. Gray's reply was in the tone of one who speaks more in sorrow than in anger.

My dear Brown [he said], I am grieved and surprised at your remarkable note. You do not seem to grasp the position in the least. A whole column in *The Proletarian*, and by Ben Bonsor, our own particular Ben! My dear fellow, it's fame, it's immortality. Just think a moment; for a whole half-hour, so to say, you, the most obscure person in the United Kingdom (excuse this, but you know your incorrigibly anonymous habits), you, I repeat, have been privileged to walk in the full glare of publicity arm-in-arm with our glorious Ben! Moreover, he has patted you on the back—that little Blenkinsop touch was worth its weight in gold. I assure you there are hundreds who would give their ears even to be slated by Ben Bonsor; and besides, you quite failed to perceive the atmosphere-producing effect of the piece. If you are to be exploited on your present book, a distinct atmosphere of cider must be created, and this is what your devoted critics are trying to do for you.

'Arm-in-arm!' exclaimed Mr. Brown with indignation. 'He hopped on top of my head, flapped his wings, cock-a-doodledo'd, and tore some of my hair out in getting down. His "atmosphere" is all cider of the *Bonsor Brand*, and his omniscient knowledge is my own dished up—I don't believe he ever heard of John Philips before in his life!'

A strong impulse on his part to read no more of the reviews was overcome by a desire to study further, for the benefit of the general public, the art and method of the critical Press as exercised in the current year of grace. Upon the importance of its functions he held strong opinions, and being really of a philosophical mind, he awaited the next instalment of journalistic wisdom without undue disturbance. It was pleasant, he remembered his favourite poet, Cowper, had said, to watch the doings of the great world through the loopholes of retreat; and his seclusion gave him several peculiar advantages for observing its reception of an unknown writer. His name, P. Brown, was also favourable to that end. 'If it were Rosebery or Roosevelt, Hohenlohe or Hohenzollern,' he said, 'it might impair that engaging gift of frankness which is the one thing that has survived our national genius, and promises to remain with us in unabated force.' The next day brought him another column in a journal of a somewhat better grade, by the well-known author Mr. D. B. Beckenham. Being an admirer of his works, Mr. Brown read it with particular interest. It was on the same general plan as the other, but of a much higher literary

class—the swift writing of a rapid and skilful dissector of books. Headed 'Cider and Poetry,' the opening paragraphs were devoted to the romance of food and drink. They compared the poverty of the modern imagination with the great overplus of our rude forefathers, who found poetry in the commonest things.

> Every trade and calling had a jingle of rhymes for its tools or appliances [said Mr. Beckenham], and every act of social life its graceful ceremonies, eating and drinking among them. We used to knight our sirloins of beef before dinner: now our sirloins (potted and tinned) knight our grocers. We brought our boars' heads to the table crowned with rosemary and song: now we only sing when our hores take their heads away from the table. We do not idealise our apple-orchards because our apple-orchards cannot idealise us. John Philips saw the poetry that is in cider: we see only the cider that was in John Philips.

He quoted from the poet; but he also quoted Mr. Brown, with approval though somewhat carelessly, like a man too pressed with avocations to bend his mind completely to the sense of the text. Mr. Brown read with gratified amusement: 'He is young, he is clever, and he is kind,' he said. 'He has written a charming essay that I shall often re-read; it is an honour to walk arm-in-arm with him; but'—he shook his head smilingly—'he has not reviewed my book.'

Mr. Beckenham's essay, however, was an exhaustive study compared with many of those that followed. The widespread objection to reading and criticising the volumes submitted to them seemed to Mr. Brown even greater among reviewers in the more expensive journals than in those which had reduced their price, as he said, to the penultimate coin of the realm. The high personages of literature, indeed, who condescended to write in them under their own names, ignored his work almost entirely, confining their efforts to the general theme he had suggested. A critic of world-wide fame, in a metropolitan sheet of equal celebrity, devoted a column and a half to the *Georgics* of Virgil (upon which the Cider Poet had modelled his epic), with no more than a single reference to the work which had prompted his dissertation. Another essayist, however, in a journal of the same rank, appeared to take personal umbrage at his having written on the subject at all, and turned aside from his brilliant treatise on the Bacchanalian poetry of the Early Greeks to rate him for two insignificant errors among his 937 painfully verified dates. Mr. Brown, however, had by this time adopted a firmly judicial attitude towards the subject of his study; the essay-writer who did not review he was willing to grant as a useful part of the atmosphere-producing machinery praised by his friend, though doubt existed in his mind as to whose atmosphere he chiefly diffused.

After this, materials for his studies in comparative criticism poured in apace, from the utmost borders of the British Isles, from the Colonies and from America. He was amazed at the number of journals in which his name and deeds were trumpeted to the reading world, and

not less at the methodical industry of the firm who procured them. Seated at his library table beside a glowing fire, with the stupendous placidities of his ancestral fields before his windows, it was, as he expected, an agreeable task to arrange and classify the specimens thus provided. He was now strictly impersonal, and, as the papers came to him whole, did not limit his purview to the notices of his own book. At the end of a few months he was able to make certain broad generalisations and specific strictures on the subject, which he deemed of value to the public. 'Do not shoot the critic, he does his best,' might be described as his general summing-up of the case. The prevailingly mild tone of the modern reviewer he freely and gladly admitted, though the knight of the bludgeon, as he discovered, was by no means extinct; and his chief defects he was willing to believe the fault of an overdriven age, of the cataclysm of print with which neither critic nor reader can cope. This, no doubt, accounted for much of the hurried and scamped writing of manifestly capable men, for their frequent blunders, their banalities, their monotony. From the examples before him he classified the tasters of the public Press under various large designations: as those who could, but would not under any circumstances, criticise the books supplied them for that end; those who would do so if they could, but, from the evidences in hand, plainly could not; and those who, with various degrees of ability, both would and could—these last being the saving salt of the profession. The first class of delinquents, the men of letters who wrote sparkling treatises on the theme of the work instead of on the work itself, he censured. 'I do not send them my book to stimulate their sufficiently nimble wits,' he said; 'and if they merely amuse their readers with the effervescence it produces in their own minds, without ample acknowledgment of the cause, their "God-fearing" stops on the hither side of honesty.' The incapables he treated with more lenience, for the pressure of the time paralyses many a good brain. The anonymous critic he pronounced, as a rule, the most painstaking and conscientious; the provincial the most appreciative; the metropolitan the most concise and workmanlike, though also, for sufficient reasons, the most perfunctory. The stereotyped form of many of the notices struck him: a single pattern seemed, with few exceptions, to serve for all; there was no time, because of the cataclysm, for varied or original treatment; but the Ben Bonsors and bludgeon-wielders were few, and the literary personages after all in the minority. His conclusion was that the unknown writer, if dealing with a popular theme, would receive abundant notice in the way of caption, space, and discussion, a certain amount of genuine reviewing, a smaller but useful amount of genuine criticism. His own subject, he was pleased to observe, excited as much interest as if, like a famous statesman, he had laid his hand on the people's bread, or even upon their beer.

Certain lapses in regard to his own book annoyed him. In the

majority of cases no reference whatever was made by the reviewer to the quality of print, illustration, or ornament: the hurried scribe fell at once on his subject-matter, leaving the reader in darkness as to whether the volume were an *édition de luxe* or a work of the style and size of the *Motor-car Pocket Poets*; the head or foot line with the publishers' name seldom affording the information. Another defect was his common failure to grasp the plainest statements of fact or opinion, although set forth in English of unimpeachable lucidity; and another—to his mind an even graver one—was the omission to differentiate his literary style from that of an ordinary trade catalogue. It was only in the thirty-fifth notice he received that its felicities were observed and commented on, and he read it with a shock not less of pleasure than of surprise at the tardy recognition of his peculiar merit. 'To speak frankly,' the writer said at the end of his short but admirable critique, 'the chief attraction of the book is its charming literary quality. Mr. Brown possesses a style that adorns its subject as unfailingly as Goldsmith's, and we shall look forward to his next work with equal interest whether it deals with small beer or the highest concerns of the Empire.' Mr. Brown felt a warm glow about his heart on reading the lines; and, in defiance of all precedent, sent the editor of the journal (a great London daily) a cheque to be forwarded to his unknown critic in token of his appreciation.

The habit of a large proportion of his reviewers, especially those of the smaller papers, of laboriously epitomising his work, and dumping its contents piece by piece, as it were, on the heads of their readers, constituted an element of popularity upon which he had not reckoned. By the time he had read most of the two hundred odd reviews sent him by the Press-cutting agency, he began to realise the extent and significance of the practice; and could not avoid the conviction that a large part of the English-speaking world were exhaustively familiar with the personality of the Cider Poet and with his writings. His ecclesiastical ancestry; his birth in the last years of the most deplorable of the Stuarts; his education at Winchester and Christ Church, Oxford; his effeminate fancy for having his long hair combed in his room while reading Milton's poems; his fondness for tobacco; his authorship of *The Splendid Shilling*, called by Addison 'the finest burlesque poem in the British (!) language;' of *The Battle of Blenheim*, composed as a tory counterblast to Addison's poem on the same subject; and of the 'idolised piece' of its age, the 'short Bacchanial Song,' first called *Pomona* and then *Cyder*, written as already mentioned in imitation of Virgil's *Georgics*, and giving a minute account of the culture of the apple-tree and the manufacture of the acidulous fluid whose name it bore—these more or less exciting details, with others, could not fail, Mr. Brown perceived, to have filtered into the minds of several millions of his fellow-beings at home and abroad. That it was inevitable, nay, desirable, that they should do so, under the present system of Press

criticism, he readily admitted; but upon that system, and its bearing on the author thus advertised, he would, as will be seen, presently have a word to say.

After waiting until a sufficient time had elapsed for the complete working out, in the present instance, of the creative mode of reviewing he had so warmly praised, Mr. Gray wrote to his friend from his London chambers:

By now [he said] you have seen the wisdom of placing yourself and your book unreservedly in our hands—I speak collectively on behalf of my journalistic brethren, for, as it happened, I had no personal part in bringing about your success. That this has been phenomenal, however, and almost a triumphal progress, every one who has seen the papers must admit; and although I will not boast, you have your critics to thank for your present enviable position. I do not doubt, also, that your financial profits have been commensurate with the remarkable publicity that we have been able to give to you and your work.

The same post brought another communication of a somewhat different tenor from his publishers, Messrs. Gabbitas & Groves, enclosing an account of the sales of his book, expenses of production, advertising and like conventionalities:

We fear you will be disappointed at the small number of copies sold [the letter said], after our unremitting efforts to advertise your work. Unfortunately, however, it is a rather expensive one (unavoidably, in view of its superior illustration, printing, paper, &c.); and although it has excited a great deal of interest among the readers of the daily papers, these, we regret to say, are not always of the class who purchase books of the kind. We trust that your forthcoming *Colley Cibber and his Circle*, which you have been good enough to promise to us, will have a better sale; but we would suggest that you put in less quotable matter, and adopt a somewhat less lively style—let it have more suet and less champagne—in a word, let it be a little dull. A good selling book, according to our experience, ought to be rather stodgy; if it is too light and attractive it leads to over-reviewing, and to satiety on the part of the public before the selling stage arrives.

To the former of these communications Mr. Brown replied that, while he appreciated the efforts of his friends of the Press, and would try to support the fame they had conferred upon him without undue elation, the financial profits of his work had not yet rendered him independent of his paternal estate, upon which, thanks to its containing a bed of excellent fireclay, he was able to live without the aid of his pen. To the letter from his publishers—at the receipt of which, as it proved the soundness of his own conclusions in the premisses, he was more gratified than grieved—he answered that he had laid aside his *Life of Cibber* for something of greater immediate interest to the public, a pamphlet on one of the pressing problems of the day entitled *The New Culture*, which he hoped soon to place in their hands. A few brief quotations from this timely and suggestive tract may not unfitly close these pages:

The assertion of those journalists [said Mr. Brown, after dealing with the matters already referred to] who contend that the critic makes the author and

his public, must be rigorously confuted: it would be more true to say that the author makes the critic and his journal as well, at least so far as its literary character is concerned. He supplies the pabulum, the basic substance, upon which the reviewer exercises such faculties as he may possess, be they acute or otherwise. The author, that is to say, places in the journalist's hands, entirely upon trust and without inquiry as to his moral or intellectual fitness, the work it may be of a lifetime, to be diffused by excerpt, epitome, or evisceration among the thousands of average persons who read the paper he serves. Moreover, he supplies it without fee or charge, a proceeding so contrary to all business principles that it proves him the same unmercantile creature to-day that he was before the Society of Authors attempted his sophistication. This, indeed, is the crux of the whole matter; and beside it the mere question of whether the critic makes the author, or the author the critic, or whether they make each other (which, to be just, is what they really do, or ought to do, under normal conditions) sinks into insignificance. In other words, the point is that while the author and the critic together enliven the world's newspapers, the newspapers pay the critic for his share in the joint entertainment, but the author pays the newspapers (to the value of the book he and his publishers supply gratuitously) for the privilege of raising them above the standing of merely political or commercial sheets. The reason hitherto put forward for the author's surprising benevolence is that the sales of his work are increased by the advertisement thus given to them —a wholly specious and illusory argument in view of the well-known fact that the reading public does not now buy books. The New Culture, indeed, dispenses with books, and depends almost entirely upon the daily Press for its mental food; and in doing so shows its wisdom, for the modern newspaper, if diligently studied, is a liberal education. This is the new democratic *régime*, which the Press proprietor well understands, but neither the author nor his publishers have yet grasped. Under its rule, which grows more absolute every day, the essayist, biographer, historian, and poet enjoy (by way of excerpt, epitome, &c.) a circulation of tens of millions, from which directly they derive no other reward than the empty futilities of fame!

Mr. Brown's array of facts, based on his estimated circulation—many millions, as just intimated—of the journals supplied him by his agents, need not be given here. Nor need we accept his arguments (not perhaps of the soundest, and probably biassed by his personal experience) for the payment, by the journals whose pages they brightened, of his brother bookmakers who did not possess beds of fireclay on their estates, or indeed any estates at all; but his generous advocacy of their cause must command our respect. He was careful to limit the principle to the rank and file of literary practitioners (with their publishers as well, for these, he pointed out, were joint sufferers under the existing arrangement), and to the newspaper Press; leaving out the popular novelists on the one hand and the strictly critical journals on the other, though not, it must be owned, offering any practical solution of the difficulties of his plan. Also, he was careful to demand for his poorer brethren no more than the minimum of a living wage, the lowest cash reward compatible with the claims of their butchers and grocers. He did not ignore the free libraries and book-clubs; but these, he insisted, merely cultivated the wives and daughters of the people, not the people themselves. He endeavoured

to show that the proletariat had never bought books; that the burgess and middle class who formerly bought them could not do so now, having to keep up greater appearances on disproportionally increased incomes; and that the upper class, who never bought many, had now to keep up their motor-cars. On the other hand, he showed that the new democracy, which included the first and second classes with no very sharp lines of demarcation, were keenly appreciative of literature in the peptonised form supplied by the daily Press, and relished their snippets and tabloids of philosophy, history, biography, and poetry, as much as their book-buying elders did their larger mouthfuls of the same commodities. He showed also that they were quite ready to pay for it in pence and halfpence, though preferably in the latter coin; and asserted that this new reading public must henceforth be the mainstay of the higher literary producer, to whom (jointly with his publishers) the Press proprietor should pay toll in proportion to the numerical output of his paper. There need be no undue friction in the readjustment; but only thus, he urged, can the torch of pure literature be kept burning, and its maintainers saved from the workhouse.

We make our daily Press proprietors knights, baronets, peers, and foreign ambassadors [he said in his peroration], and our poets and essayists paupers, eleemosynaries, and schoolmasters—dwellers in caves, colleges, places of secondary education, disused granaries, and like dim and sepulchral abodes; and not until the balance is redressed will the New Culture rest on the sound and permanent basis of financial equity.

A. G. HYDE.

BRITAIN'S TASK IN EGYPT

JUSTICE, firmness, tact, and sympathy should be the guiding principles —the watchwords—of Lord Cromer's successor in the difficult part he has to play, if success is to attend his efforts in continuing the beneficent work so ably and uninterruptedly carried on in Egypt since 1882—the work which is, and which will long remain, Britain's task in Egypt. And to-day the most important of these watchwords is sympathy; sympathy the solace; the complete sustaining charitableness which is as instructive as it is animating; the fellow-feeling 'which whispers conviction that no evidence can authorise'; the sympathy that is part of our being. Consequently in this paper I shall endeavour to make every suggestion helpful and calculated to strengthen the bonds of harmony, and every criticism well-natured so that mutual sympathy and understanding may be engendered between the two peoples who are manifestly destined to work together in the interests, and for the future well-being, of the fertile Green Egyptian Fan and of the New Soudan.

Evidently Lord Dufferin was in agreement with this view when he wrote, deprecating any 'irritating and exasperating display of authority,' and when he advocated a policy of 'sympathy and guidance' and of 'sympathetic advice and assistance.'

So also, in the final paragraphs of what, unfortunately, proves to be his lordship's last report on his administration of Egypt, Lord Cromer strikes the same note, with no uncertain emphasis and distinctness, when he writes:

> I often hear it stated by those who are in a position to judge—both Europeans and Egyptians—that of late years there has been a tendency amongst some of the British officials to get out of touch with the Egyptians, and that, in fact, the sympathy between the two races, which ought to increase as the beneficial results of British interference become more and more apparent, is somewhat diminishing. . . . But if there be any widening of the breach between the two races, it is capable of repair. . . . I am frequently told that the younger race of British officials, who have come to this country of recent years, are not so careful to abstain from wounding Egyptian susceptibilities as their predecessors. . . . I wish to draw the very marked attention of every British official in Egypt to this subject. No reasonable person in this country thinks that any of the British servants of the Khedive are dishonest or unjust. It is almost equally

important that they should be sympathetic. It is reasonable that I should be asked to explain more clearly what I mean. It is difficult for me to do so . . . but I am none the less certain that generally that confidence can be commanded and that good will can be acquired. It is for each individual British official to learn by experience, and by constant study of the characters of those with whom he is brought in contact, how to command the one and to acquire the other. Notably he should remember that . . . under the peculiar conditions existing in this country, any thoughtless or inconsiderate word or act may not only wound, when there is no intention of wounding, but also produce consequences of a far-reaching character. . . . One of the most important of their duties is to endeavour to acquire the sympathies of the people with whom they have to deal. If they succeed, they will meet their reward in the comparative ease with which the various reforms in which they are interested are accomplished.

Corroboration of what Lord Cromer states is needless to those who know, and have worked under, him. Yet I am constrained to mention that when in Egypt this winter many of my native and European friends bore out this charge of want of sympathy among the younger race of British officials. I am thoroughly in accord with Lord Cromer in all he says and particularly with his lordship's dictum that 'the widening of the breach is capable of repair.' During my long service in Egypt I had no difficulty in gaining the confidence of all classes, from the Khedive on the throne to the patient, unsophisticated fellah, and when, in September 1904, this Review published 'My Friend the Fellah,' the late Sir Charles Cookson, a staunch friend to Egypt, wrote to me—'I believe that your article will, when translated into his language, serve to promote that mutual understanding and sympathy which is after all the surest bond of union between the governing and the governed.'

It may be urged by persons but slightly acquainted with Egypt that however much the British official may strive he will find no answering chord in the native. So I must make a short digression. Leading London journals have stated that Lord Cromer, when news of his resignation became known, was the recipient of many touching letters from the native peasantry. One can only surmise in what language these letters were actually couched—probably in somewhat fulsome terms but nevertheless assuredly written from the heart. I have before me a bundle of similar letters, written, it is true, not to an 'uncrowned king,' but to a much more humble official when he quitted Egypt after labouring in that country nearly twenty-five years. But because these letters show that the native *is* responsive to sympathy and is really grateful I venture to quote (in translation) three sentences, each one culled from a different letter, and written from a different province of Egypt:

(1) The spirit of fairness and the great kindliness you have ever shown in dealing with us has gained for you not only our gratitude, but, if you will permit the expression, our affection.

(2) I find it quite impossible to describe the sorrow your departure occasions.

(3) My heart weeps when I think of your fatherly goodness, generous support, and extreme kindliness. I crave pardon for having so often worried you, but I ventured thus frequently to have recourse to your goodness because I believed blindly in your counsel.

To continue quoting extracts, which could be extended for many pages, would be wearisome. Enough has been said to clearly demonstrate that Egyptians *are* amenable to sympathetic treatment.

But our task in Egypt is so beset with difficulties that it behoves all Englishmen to help in so far as they are able—and not to leave the whole burden of responsibility on the shoulders of the British Agent and on those of the devoted band of hard-working, and often over-wrought, Anglo-Egyptian officials. Even loyal friends of Egypt are *not* always helpful, however well-intentioned. For instance, Mr. Dicey, in his recent little book, *The Egypt of the Future*, sows broadcast seeds which, should they fall on congenial soil, are calculated to produce a crop of troubles. Fortunately the misleading representation by Mr. Dicey of Lord Dufferin's policy has been pointed out and corrected by Sir Auckland Colvin in this Review for April. Further refutation is needless, but it is necessary to nail another false coin to the counter. In his current article entitled 'Lord Cromer's Legacy,' Mr. Bourne has so re-stated his lordship's plan for a Legislative Council as to make it appear that, were the proposal adopted, Great Britain would have a certain majority—*i.e.* would command twenty voices out of the total of thirty-six members. I am convinced that the writer had not the slightest intention of misleading anyone, and that it was in perfect good faith that he proceeded to argue against Lord Cromer's ideal. Yet his premises cannot be held, on careful examination of the facts, to be sound. *His* statement of the case is as follows :—

If, as Lord Cromer recommends, the number of members composing the new Council is fixed at thirty-six, the suggestion is that four of them shall be English officials in the service of the Egyptian Government, that five shall be unofficial members nominated by the Egyptian Government, and that seven shall be European judges, who, of course, are also public servants in the pay of the Egyptian Government. The other twenty are, it is proposed, to be elected by a process designed to give to each European nationality represented in Egypt a voting power approximating to its numerical and trading value. . . . The number of elected members chosen from a single nationality being limited to four, four British subjects are certain to be elected, and assuming that on most occasions, if not on all, these four British subjects will vote in support of British policy—that is, in company with the sixteen official and unofficial nominees of the Government—the British Agent may safely count on a majority of votes on any legislative project he favours, seeing that, as the reader scarcely needs to be reminded, the Egyptian Government, though nominally subordinate to the Khedive, is really in absolute dependence on the instructions of the British Agent.

The fallacy of this contention is apparent to those acquainted with the composition of the Mixed Tribunals in Egypt and with the

honourability and independence of the judges, but to the less well-informed reader it may well appear sound reasoning.

I agree with the writer's assumption that the four British officials and the four elected British subjects would presumably generally vote together. And for the sake of argument it may be admitted that the five 'unofficial members nominated by the Egyptian Government' would, as a rule, vote with the eight Englishmen. But even this would only give thirteen votes out of thirty-six. The question of the seven judges remains. Now, Lord Cromer thus sums up his proposal as regards these seven members :—

> In the next place, I would propose that seven judges should be named members of the Council—namely, the Vice-President of the Native Court of Appeal, provided he is a European, and six judges of the mixed Courts. As regards the selection of the latter, some—for instance, the Vice-President of the Court of Appeal and the Presidents of the Courts of First Instance—might be *ex officio* members, and the remainder chosen by the whole body of magistrates, or the latter procedure might be adopted in the case of all the selections.

Inasmuch as the judges are picked men of the highest integrity, of different nationalities, and irremovable during their five years (renewable) mandate except with the consent of the European Power by whom they were nominated, it goes without saying that their votes on the Legislative Council would be given without fear or favour and would be influenced by nothing save the opinion they might form, after mature consideration, for or against any given proposal.

It is true that, on occasion, this opinion might coincide with that of the British Members of the Council, but it is childish to predict, and misleading to affirm, that the British Agency could always, or ever, 'safely count' on their support.

I therefore appeal to writers of articles on Egypt—particularly of controversial articles—to more carefully study their facts before proceeding with their argument. For a certain body of malcontents in Egypt are ever ready to seize on conclusions, if favourable to their views, and are not straightforward enough to admit that the deductions were drawn from inaccurate premises.

I appeal also to cultured gentlemen, like Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, to lend a powerful helping hand in making our task in Egypt easier by being less prone to use their talents in fault-finding; by remembering that our hard-worked officials in Egypt are doing their best; and by refraining from adding fuel to the smouldering embers of discontent. Rather let them pour oil on the troubled waters by assisting in the work of fostering that human concord and good will between the rulers and the ruled which serve as mighty bonds of empire.

I would likewise appeal to Sir Edward Grey, our able Foreign Secretary, to essay to induce the Cabinet to consider whether it would not be an opportune, wise, and statesmanlike policy to cultivate

more cordial relations with the Suzerain Power, and so to strengthen the position of our Ambassador to Turkey as to make it less difficult for him to succeed in persuading the Sultan to refrain from transmitting to Egypt commands which, if obeyed, must cause conflict with the interests of the occupying Power. Further a conciliated suzerain might graciously consent to withdraw from Egypt that disturbing influence, the Turkish High Commissioner, whose position since Sir Henry Drummond Wolff's mission terminated in 1887 has been but a strange anomaly. The gallant and learned Ghazi Mukhtar Pasha, having officially nothing to do save to represent the principle of Turkish suzerainty, has unfortunately employed his idle years and his great abilities in creating mischievous friction, to say nothing of procuring subventions for local newspapers. His disappearance from the Egyptian stage would materially help towards a better understanding, for, as Lord Dufferin said in the concluding phrase of his masterly despatch of the 6th of February, 1883, 'the stability of our handiwork will not be assured unless it is clearly understood by all concerned that no subversive influence will intervene between England and the Egypt she has re-created.'

I hold strongly the opinion that the Khedive Abbas Hilmy has not on every occasion been treated with marked sympathy, but his Highness is now so well known in England, to our gracious King and to many members of the Royal Family, that to gain his entire confidence should need but little effort; but that effort must be made and must be coupled with that uniformly respectful consideration which is due to the Ruler of the Nile Valley.

Lastly I would appeal to the powerful 'Fourth Estate'; but in making this appeal I do not presume to catalogue the many ways in which the Press could serve the country in this matter, for, happily, our editors and sub-editors are gentlemen of great acumen, and of the highest intellect, and are, for the most part, most ably served by their correspondents in Egypt.

It is difficult to treat the aims and demands of the Nationalist party with seriousness. The image will protrude itself of a child wishing to run before it can barely toddle, or of the same infant crying for some pretty fruit before it is ripe. For, without doubt, the plain fact is that the members of the Nationalist party are not yet ripe for the responsibilities and cares of self-government. I do not mean that there are not clever men in Egypt, for indeed I have the honour of knowing intimately many Egyptian gentlemen of marked intelligence and ability. But they are nearly all ministers or ex-ministers and are too wise to think that Egypt is able at present to walk alone. *The 'National' party does not represent the Nation.* Their demands, when not for reforms already contemplated by the Government though postponed owing to financial or other considerations, verge either on the extravagant or on the absurd. For instance, they ask

for the creation of an Egyptian Parliament, though obviously to grant such a demand at present would be tantamount to handing over the country once again to anarchy.

The existing Egyptian General Assembly, which meets once every two years, has just held a Session which lasted but four days, during which short time, and with practically no discussion worthy of the name, eighty-five proposals were considered, and of these fifty-four were hurriedly passed. Reporters were not present, but it soon leaked out that the proceedings were scarcely orderly. The one bright record of this curious Session is the patient reasoning of the Minister of Education on the question of using Arabic as the sole medium of teaching in the schools. Are these men fit to manage the affairs of the Nation? And yet the bulk of them would presumably be members of the wished-for Parliament.

Another of the Nationalist demands, formulated but three months ago, is quaintly naïve. They asked for 'the formation of Chambers of Commerce—"such as is the rule in all European countries"—to fix the price of necessaries,' being apparently blissfully unaware that prices are governed by the law of supply and demand.

If Egypt really wishes to have its own Constitution it must gain its liberation by means of intellectual progress. For the time being the demand for a Parliament seems futile as well as premature. It will be time enough to seriously consider this grave question when really representative Egyptians—and not a noisy faction—present a reasoned petition for extended powers of self-government.

Doubtless some of the ringleaders, men of little weight for the most part, of the Egyptian malcontents of to-day are so imbued with extravagant ideas that to gain them over to a more reasonable attitude will require that patience 'which is the rope of advancement in all lines of life'; but a sympathetic attitude towards the rank and file of their followers should quickly induce these last to cease from kicking against the pricks, and to loyally accept the fact which dominates the situation, namely that, in the words of Lord Cromer, 'the British Government have no intention of exercising the discretionary power vested in them of withdrawing the British garrison from Egypt.'

Not unfrequently is it a hard thing to gain the confidence and sympathy of even those who live as we live, who think as we think, but the difficulty is greater far when we are dealing with peoples whose ways are *not* as our ways, whose thoughts are *not* as our thoughts. Yet the attempt is well worth making in the certain hope of assisting in Britain's task in Egypt.

WALTER F. MIÉVILLE.

CHILDREN'S COMPETITIONS

II

In continuing the specimens of children's work which were given under the above heading in this Review some months ago, it may be as well first to correct the assumption made by a writer in one of the leading provincial organs, viz. that the paper in which this particular Children's Page appeared was published at sixpence a week. Its price was, as a matter of fact, only one penny weekly, so that it came within the reach of very varied classes, though it appealed perhaps more particularly to the upper than to the lower middle-class population.

In the former article examples were given of the work sent in for many different kinds of competitions, but story-writing was not included. It was, however, always a popular competition, and some specimens of the children's work in this line will perhaps be of interest. It must be confessed that the plots of the stories were, as a rule, hopelessly commonplace, though the style in which they were written was often distinctly amusing, and sometimes, after ploughing through a large batch, the reader was rewarded by coming upon a sudden and refreshing hint of originality. One of these seemed to be shown in a story by a child of ten, which began with this sentence: 'Sqweaker was a big indiarubber doll. She was called Sqweaker because when you sqweezed her she sqweaked.'

After telling how the kitchen table was covered with good things which had been prepared for Christmas Day, and how 'Sqweaker' had been left lying on the floor, while her little mistresses played in the next room, it went on:

> Suddenly the outside door (which was ajar) opened, and in crept a tramp—he walked on four legs, and had a shaggy coat. Patter Patter he went across the floor to the table, then he stepped on Sqweaker, who at once gave a sqweak. The tramp stopped in wonder. Marjorie and Alice hering the squeak came running into the kitchen. Oh, you naughty dog you were going to eat our dinner, shoo, and they frightened the dog outside. Then they ran into the kitchen and picked Sqweaker off the floor. Oh, you darling Sqweaker you've saved our dinner, you shall have a new dress tomorrow as a present.

But sometimes stories much more startling than this came to brighten the lot of the children's editor (though indeed such a lot

could never be a dull one !). The following tale by a little girl of eleven owes much, no doubt, to its weird spelling, but even without that aid it would be amusing :

It was New Years eve, and Edith and Roselind sat in the hall at Magblien Castel in Scotland. Donald, their big brother, was out, but they had stayed at home because of their colds. The great hall was suposed to be haunted, and they had been telling grewsome storys. It was 12 P.M., and they were feeling rather frightned. 'What's that ?' said Edith, as a low groan came from behind the scrien. A lady, deathley white, came out and pointed with a bony hand to her throat in which was a bloody dagger. Roselind was struck dum with horer but Edith rushed screaming to the floor, where she fell into Donald's arms. 'What's the matter ?' he said. Edith pointed, and as the lady faided from their sight Donald wispered, 'It was our ansestor's goast.'

This is short and to the point, and shows no signs of 'padding,' and there is no doubt the whole scene was vivid enough in the little authoress's mind.

Sometimes a story which began in a quite ordinary manner would come to an unexpected or even dramatic ending, as in the case of a tale of a princess, who, having refused many rich suitors, was told she must marry the first beggar who came to the door. This happened to be a fiddler.

Then the girl began to weep. 'Do not weep,' cried the fiddler. 'Come along, my hut is down this lane, and there we can make a fire and boil a pot.' The princess did not know how to boil a saucepan and she asked the fiddler if he knew and he said, 'Yes, I will show you.' He made no more to do but took a knife, cut off her head. And that was the end of the poor princess.

Does this tale contain a moral pointed at modern 'princesses' who do not know how to boil a saucepan ? Whether such was the intention of the ten-year-old writer is open to doubt, but, at any rate, we may trust that few modern romances come to such a tragic ending.

The children's opinions on books and their writers were often interesting, and not lacking in the critical faculty. One would not, I think, go far wrong in putting down the writer of the following as a mixture of a bookworm and a tomboy :

I think Reading is my favourite hobby. Boys' books, tales of travel, and fighting; naval battles especially. G. W. Kingston is the author I like best, he writes about the sea generally, some are exceptions, such as 'Manco the Peruvian Chief,' which deals with the adventures of a young Englishman among the Indians, with whom he continually gets mixed. . . . The world-famed and well-known Scotish writer Sir Walter Scot, has attractions for me, only he writes such long descriptions of scenes, places, dress, and sometimes relationship. . . . Ainsworth's 'Tower of London' and 'Windsor Castle,' though somewhat in the Historical line, are books I am fond of, the characters of the dwarf and giants are very interesting.

A competition for the best essay on the writer's favourite poet had some interesting results, though the entries, alas ! were not numerous. One child wrote :

My favourit poet is William Shakespear. I am piticuly fond of his plays, thoug I have only read 'The taming of the Shrew' as a play. Cristofer Sly is a very amusing caricter. 'For God's sake, a pot of small ale,' he says, when awaking he finds himself transformed into a noble lord.

One wonders whether it can have been this exclamation that made the child think Sly an 'amusing caricter.' The essay continued:

Most of Shakespear's life was spent at Stratford, in a quaint old house round which is a garden where every flower he menchoned in his plays are grown. His wife, Ann Hathaway and himself went at a house called 'New Place,' where Shakespear planted the selabrated mulbery-tree. With the money he got from his play 'The tempest,' he is suposed to have bought himself a pocet sundile to be 'still seen' at the Stratford musem. A thing rather like a broard bangle to anything but an experinced person. In the gramair school Shakespear saw his first play and acted as 'Adam' in 'As you like it.' His toom is in the big church and is suposed to be the last poddle take of 'William Shakespear.'

A 'selabrated,' mulberry-tree sounds, or rather looks (in print), like a new species, and 'pocet sundile' at the first glance might almost be taken for a Latin phrase. The concluding words form a puzzle which is hard to solve unless one reads 'model' for 'poddle,' and even then the meaning is not altogether clear.

Most of the essays sent in for this competition had either Tennyson or Longfellow as their subject, but one girl of sixteen proved to be a warm advocate of Lord Byron's claims to popularity. She wrote:

There is a stroke of genius in all his poems, and through many there runs a thread of romance, of sadness, no doubt accounted for by his disappointment in love, and by his infirmity. The reason he is my favourite poet lies in the fact that in all his works abound movement and life. I do not like a poet only for the correctness of his metre, but for the strength of character which he depicts. In Byron's face there is an independence, a rugged self-will, that shows the man's nature. He was run down and spoken against, but, after all, who is so perfect that he can afford to slander another?

A competition for the best written copy of a verse of poetry brought forth a gem which one would have been sorry to miss. The writer's naïve comment leads one to wonder whether a similar meaning has ever been read into these lines before.

Verse on Daffodils. By Wordsworth. The last verse of a poem, telling how when wandering on the margin of a bay, the poet saw 'A hoast of goalden Daffodils,' which because of their beauty left a great impresion on him. Since then aparently the author has become a cripple.

For oft when on my couch I lie,
In vackent or in pencive mood,
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude.
And then my heart with pleasure fills
And dances with the daffodils.

The spelling mistakes suggest that the verse must have been written from memory. The same little girl was the writer of an essay on Daffodils, which is worthy of reproduction.

My favourite spring flowers are dafodils, especially when they are massed. A hoast of golden daffodils, as Wordsworth says, is I think one of the most beautiful sights one can see. But some how these beautiful flowers seem the shortist lived of all. 'Fair daffodils, we weep to see you haste away so soon,' says Robert Herrick, and I am sure we all agree. 'The daffadil most danty is,' says Dryton. I think to look into their lovely golden senter is a pleasure indeed. How beautiful they are, singaly as well as massed, but massed ones are best. I dont think daffodils look half as nice in an elegent painted or glass vase as in a big jam jar. It seems to suet them so much the best, and I love to see their pretty stalks.

This youthful essayist displays a real love of beauty, but one doubts whether correct spelling will ever become a possibility to her! When the editor of the Page ventured to comment on the number of mistakes in one essay, she replied as follows:

Dear *****, I am so sorry you could not understand all the words in my last essay but I have made them planer in this one I think. I am sorry I have not competed for such a long time, but before Xmas I was so bussy making shawls ect: ect: for the old wemen and men in the vilige.

Another little girl wrote:

I have now begun to take an intres in your Page, although we have take it for a very long time. Now a long for the paper every week, and the most intresting competitions. I hope I get a prize for 'my favourite poet,' although it is my first time trying.

'I enclose my essay on my foverouit poet,' said another competitor, 'which I hope will be very satasfactury.' Another sent the following rather amusing request: 'I am very fond of drawing, but if we have a drawing competition I do hope it is not cats, because I can't draw them'!

A competition for the twelve best 'New Year Resolutions' afforded some interesting glimpses into the characters of the competitors, and their various special faults and failings. To their credit be it said that they were not backward in recognising where improvement was desirable. The following is a miscellaneous selection of 'resolutions,' some of which might, one feels, be adopted with advantage by the community at large.

Remember we are here but for a span, so we must do what good we can. Promise little but do much. Forget others' faults by remembering your own. Get up early in the morning. Not to be such a bookworm. To do household duties at once, even if I dislike them. To practise my music well every day. To stay in more than I did last year, and let others out. To be more careful with my clothes. To try and behave always like a lady, and not like a tomboy. To take more pains with your lessons, and remember your teacher gets as tired of teaching as you do of learning. Not to get into hasty tempers or sulks. To be thoughtful, kind and gentle to all we come in contact with, whether it is any person or animal, bird or insect of any kind. To do whatever we have to do as well as we can, ever aiming at the towering peak of Success. Never to carry tales and so hurt another's feelings. Never to despise a girl because she is poor and not finely dressed, remembering that sometimes a diamond is found in a lump of earth. If you feel an angry word rise to your lips, bite your

tongue and count twenty. Never 'get out of bed the wrong side;' it is a very unpleasant thing to do, both for yourself and others. Don't say 'I can't' or 'I sha'n't,' but 'I can' and 'I will.'

A number of suggestions, practical and the reverse, were forthcoming when a prize was offered for the best essay on 'How to spend a hot day.' Picnics, boating parties, and so on, had many advocates, but I think few would agree with the child (aged fourteen) who wrote:

To sit out-of doors and read up for some stiff exam., all around would be peaceful and quiet, nothing to disturb or distract my attention from the books which I am studying. To hear every now and again the leaves rushling, or the birds whistling brings my thoughts back to everyday life.

Her second suggestion would perhaps be more popular, though the breathlessness of her style makes one feel hot rather than cool!

Or to fish by some shady stream, overhanging with trees, scarcely a sound to be heard, all alone in one's glory, passing one of the nicest and most peaceful hours on the hottest day of the summer, away from the noise and bustle of the town or city, or the trouble and worries of life, forgetting all the past thoughts for the time being, enjoying one's self to the utmost.

'To be out of doors under the shady trees is lovely in the extreme,' writes a child of twelve, 'seeing through the bowers of the trees the blue sky, and the birds flying through the air makes one love to be in the land of the living.'

This love of the open air was shown in most of the essays, but one little girl had another suggestion to make, which was as follows:

One of the best things to do is to stay indoors (with the windows shut to keep out the hot air, and the blinds down). . . . One's occupations for such a day should be nil. . . . To go out in such heat is, to my thinking, not pleasure. . . . Some people prefer to lie in a hammock and read. Also some people enjoy the heat while others dislike it.

The following suggestion, made for the benefit of unfortunate dwellers in towns, is somewhat novel:

For those who live in a large town I do not think there is any way for them to keep cool, especially those who have not a garden. You will find the coolest place to lie on in the house is the floor, as air always runs low, and also there are not a lot of thick things to suck it up.

There seems to be an echo of a science lesson here, and were the suggestion to be universally adopted it would be worth while taking a peep into many London houses during the hot weather, simply for the sake of beholding the different members of a family lying stretched upon the floor!

Pets were always a popular subject, and it was a girl of fifteen who gave the following advice as to the treatment of a canary:

In the summer, never let the sun beat full down on your Canary, as I have known of Birds die from sunstroke, the same as ourselfs. For when they are free, they can shelter in cool trees.

And who has not been acquainted with a pet dog such as is described in this paper ?

The principal pet, which I know anything about, is a little pet dog of our own called, Edward. It is a pomeranian. He is a very weak dog. We have to be very particular in what we give him to eat. His principal feeding is Spratt's Puppie Biscuits, ground down, and a little cooked meat mixed in it, and sometimes a little gravy to moisten it. We occasionally give him some milk, which he likes very much, and we would give him more, but it seems to fatten him to much. He is greatly troubled with a stomach cough, so we give him a powder which the veterian surgeon subscribed for him, and a teaspoonful of Olive Oil occasionally, which he licks off the spoon himself without any trouble. His bed is a round basket with a cushion in it.

When a competition was announced for the best nonsense rhymes (with given first lines), some of the entries were entertaining in the extreme. A few competitors failed to write in the Limerick metre, but some of their efforts were too good to be lost. We cannot deny that the deathbed of the young man in the following verses was, to say the least of it, an unusual one :

There was a young man of Jamaica
This tale I tell you is true
He leaved next door to a baker
And tried his daughter to woo.

But this maid was coy and contented
And wished not her condition to change
The poor young man he lamented
And died on the kitchen range.

Fourteen years was the age of the author of these lines, and also of the child who wrote :

There was a young maid of Madrid
Who went to the market fair,
Along the way she slid,
Which act did make her sware.

Her sweetheart passeth by
The word he heard and fled
You wonder children why
The girl he feared to wed.

Some attempts in the intended metre are given below, the ages of the writers being thirteen, eighteen, and sixteen respectively :

There was a young man of Jamaica,
Who went off abroad as a baker,
But after a time,
When all was sublime,
He came back again a shoe-maker.

There was a young man of Jamaica,
Who adopted the trade of a baker ;
He made currant buns
Which were heavy as tons
And disagreed with all but their maker.

There was a young man of Jamaica,
Who chose for his trade that of baker.
But his customers died,
Till the doctor espied
Germs! And kicked that young man of Jamaica.

It was noteworthy that the rhymes 'baker' and 'maker' were used by practically every competitor. One made use of 'Quaker' and one of 'take her,' but these were the only exceptions. Before leaving the subject of contributions in verse some extracts are given from a poem by a child of ten, entitled *The Flight of the Swallows*. The falling-off in the last verse is too obvious to need comment:

Christmas comes in winter
When the earth is covered with snow
When the swallows seek a country
Where warmer breezes blow.

'Tis too cold for the little swallows
While festivities we enjoy
So when the earth in white is drest
They vanish like a joy. . . .

In the evening when the gas is lit
And the fire gives out a blaze
When all of us by the fireside sit
Until someone a song will raise,

Night has crept round to morning
Christmas Day has gone again
But Boxing Day is beginning
We can tell by the noise in the Lane.

A popular pastime among children of all ages was the writing of 'Book Title Stories,' of which the following was one of the most surprising examples received:

'Kathrine Regina' walked up 'The Hill' to meet 'The fishing girl' when 'a little summer shower' came on. 'She' was now passing 'the Monestry' and knowing that 'She' was forbiden to speak to 'the Fishing Girl' and know alsow that they would bedetect her by her wet cloths she took shelter, when 'Dr. Nicola' came by. Katrain was frightned of being cought by him and 'she' ran down the road, but made 'a Fatle mistake' and Fell into the river. 'Three men in a boat' at once set out to rescu her. 'Dr. Nocala' hurried down and swam to her assistance like a 'Hero' and she was helped out and returned to her home, 'A house in Blumsbury.'

It was not difficult to 'bedetect,' as the above-quoted writer would have it, signs of talent in various directions among the many children who took part in these competitions, but it will easily be believed that the neatly written and correctly spelt essays and stories were not always those that brought most joy to the editor's heart. Some of the examples that have been quoted, though not equal in originality to the productions of 'Pet Marjorie,' Sir Walter Scott's famous little friend, can yet hardly fail to remind one of her writings.

If 'Children's Pages' had existed in Pet Marjorie's day, what a delight her contributions would have been! One has only to recall some extracts from her journals to see this. For instance:

> Yesterday a marrade man . . . offered to kiss me, and offered to marry me though the man was espused, and his wife was present and said he must ask her permission, but he did not, I think he was ashamed or confounded before 3 gentlemen . . . A sailor called here to say farewell, it must be dreadful to leave his native country, where he might get a wife or perhaps me, for I love him very much and with all my heart, but O I forgot, Isabella forbid me to speak about love.

Or again where she describes herself and Mr. Crakey walking 'hand-in-hand in innocence and matitation sweet,' or Isabella jumping 'with filisity over wals and fences'; or her charmingly frank confession as to the poetry of 'grey': 'I am sorry to say that I think it is very difficult to get by heart, but we must bear it well.' Or again: 'Remorse is the worst thing to bear and I am afraid that I will fall a marter to it.' Then who could ever forget this declaration: 'I am very strong and robust and not of the delicate sex, nor of the fair but of the deficient in looks'; or that unequalled poem beginning

> Three turkeys fair their last have breathed,
> And now this world for ever leaved?

But when we once begin to quote 'Pet Marjorie' it is almost impossible to know where to stop. The chances of finding her equal among modern child-writers are few indeed; but nevertheless those who love children (and even those who do not) cannot fail to find in their literary efforts a source of unending interest and enjoyment. The many periodicals which nowadays encourage their young readers to express their often delightfully fresh and naïve thoughts and opinions on paper are surely on the whole doing a good work, even though in some cases they may give an undesirable stimulus to that universal 'writing craze' which is said to be the bane of modern literature. But if they are instrumental in helping even one budding 'Pet Marjorie' to develop her powers, the existence of 'Children's Pages'—apart from the pleasure given to the competitors as a whole—will be fully justified.

EVA M. MARTIN.

THE DOGS OF BÀGHDAD

A STUDY FROM LIFE

I DARESAY every schoolboy knows where Baghdad is; but, none the less, it may be as well to mention that the discrowned capital of the Arab Caliphs (*Khalìfa*=successor, *i.e.* of Muhammad) lies on the middle portion of the Tigris, or 'arrow-river'—the Hiddekel [1] of Holy Scripture—some three days' journey eastward from the ruins of Babylon. It does not belong to Persia, although more than once Persian generals have seized it for the Shàh, their master; and not to Arabia, although the Arab cloak and headdress are among its most familiar features. Politically, it falls within the Asiatic division of the Osmanli Sultan's empire; geographically, it is referable to the ancient land of Chaldæa, called by Arabs El Iràk, or 'Iràk Arabì,' as distinct from another 'Iràk,' a province of Persia. Only one other fact of topography need here be noted, because of its bearings on a singular piece of canine natural history which will appear in the sequel. However remote Baghdad may be considered, it is the reverse of isolated. Apart from a route *via* the Volga and the Caspian, and apart from numerous post roads passing through Persia, various more or less direct lines of communication connect it with the Mediterranean. And, easiest of all, a weekly mail steamer leaves Bombay and Karàchi for the Persian Gulf and the port of Basra; from which a privileged British company sends travellers up the Tigris to Baghdad, and no further, in a three or four days' passage of some five hundred miles.

The Wàli Pasha, or provincial Osmanli Governor, is generally very clever at counting his money. He also keeps a strict reckoning of the Arabian horses and camels, Persian mules, and white donkeys from El Ahsà, which are continually reaching him as complimentary offerings. But no instance is recorded of his being tempted to perpetrate King David's folly of numbering the people; so that it can only be by a piece of guesswork that the population of Baghdad in its declined condition is commonly stated as 100,000. In the same way

[1] Gen. ii. 14.

It is only by guessing that anyone can hit off a census of the curly-tailed community which is about to be brought before the reader. Suffice it to say on this point that the area over which, on both banks of the river, the men, women, and children are distributed cannot, with its many waste spaces, fall short of seven hundred acres; and that the whole of that extensive surface is meandered over by canine watchers. Wherever a Lazarus lies in wait for a dole at the gate of Dives; wherever an *omnium-gatherum* rubbish-heap fringes the street corner; wherever the supply of carrion and offal promises to be regular, there is to be found a station of philosophers of the Cynic school. How many generations of breeding and culture does it take, I wonder, to develop that aristocratic nonchalance and sublime exclusiveness which large classes of humanity are glad to reckon among their characteristics? But behold the same lovely qualities produced naturally in a midden-crew of untraceable parentage! Banded together in guilds or brotherhoods, each of which strictly observes its own municipal boundary, the dogs of Baghdad exhibit that *ne plus ultra* of doggedness which in the human species so often passes for strength of character. From time immemorial not one of them has ever answered to a name, or worn a collar or a muzzle, or called any man master. The rule of the order is exactly that of the sparrows, which live among human habitations, and pick up their food at door-steps, without ever crossing a threshold. Like Burns's 'commoners of air,' they claim no other roof-tree than the blue vault of heaven, not untempered, however, by the shelter of crumbling ruins. If ever anybody heard one of them say 'Hail fellow, well met!' to a stranger of his own species it is a wonder. The reception given to a new boy at a public school is bland and amiable, compared with the birssy, surly manners of the dogs collectively, when the denizen of a different *quartière* timorously and tentatively shows his nose among them. After a brief parley, conducted in some primitive guttural language, the intruder is made to run for his life. A good many years ago one of the European traders who come to Baghdad to make their fortunes and return to their respective countries brought with him a small black poodle which he regarded with feelings of respect and affection resembling those of the American savage for his totem. He resided in what is considered the European quarter, consisting of a series of small châteaux, each in its own grove of palm-trees, by the side of a narrow thoroughfare which, proceeding from the direction of the British Consulate, debouches on the trackless and illimitable desert. Naturally enough, our friend desired to take his dog with him when he went out riding in the cool of the day dawn—'what time the birds are in their nests,' as the sixth century Arabian balladist[2] hath it. Outside in the desert it was all clear sailing. The difficulty was how to get his little favourite past the dogs which patrolled the intervening spaces. Blackmail was tried in the first instance. That

[2] Imrau 'l Kais, or 'Man of [the tribe of] Kais.'

is, by way of paying footing, food was set before the green-eyed natives, who, however, instead of being gained over by this simplest form of 'treating' only turned the crustier. If ever one of them whose muzzle was in a mess of pottage chanced to catch a glimpse with a corner of his eye of the foreigner's 'curled darling,' it would not be his fault if he failed to grab him. This being so, there was nothing for it but to place the *petit maître* in a saddle-bag, carry him as the old-fashioned earth-stopper does his terriers, and set him down in the desert. For a time this plan answered, and the canine curmudgeons of the town were baffled. But, according to the view of life which runs, more or less, through every mode of thinking, that which is to be will happen, or, as a Persian poet[3] puts it, 'The dove that is never to see its nest again will be impelled by Fate towards the bait and the snare,' and one unlucky morning poor 'Jacques,' chancing to stray from his master, was not only killed but eaten; at least, all that was ever recovered of his small personality was the brass name-plate of his leathern collar. It were tedious here to bring in the story of how his tragic death was avenged by his master. The period was when Great Britain, France, and Turkey were holding on together to the nose of the Muscovite Empire in the Crimea. The *entente cordiale* between the principal European Consulates and the local Government accordingly stood at a high point. In some Oriental cities it is even possible for a human being, especially a woman, to be taken out into the wilds and foully murdered without any proceedings following, or so much as a constable being sent to view and bury the body, in cases where there are no relatives to notify the crime and clamour for justice. The dogs of Baghdad, as already stated, are ownerless; more distinctly so, it is shrewdly to be suspected, than the pigeons of the recent Denshawi 'incident.' And in view of so many concurrent circumstances, the likelihood may easily be estimated of the local authorities vexing themselves, when a European gentleman, entitled under the redoubtable 'Capitulations' to 'the most favourable treatment,' chose to take the law into his own hands, and do to death a pretty considerable number of street dogs, at once *pour encourager les autres* and as a sacrifice to the manes of his perished familiar.

From all that has gone before let no one, however, jump to the conclusion that the subjects of this sketch count for nothing in their native city. Far from it. Four-footed creatures, homeless and nameless, can hardly be classed with public servants; and yet, so well and faithfully do the dogs of Baghdad perform certain important duties which are more or less entrusted to them that they may fairly claim to be regarded as members of the body politic—a fact sufficiently attested by the established custom of a town officer going his rounds daily with a sack of girdle cakes hanging over his shoulder and distributing the food among them gratis. Nobody who has

[3] Shaikh Maslihu 'd dín, Sádi [born about 1184 A.D.], in his *Gulistán*, or 'Rose-garden.'

travelled in Eastern countries needs to be informed that the duties in consideration of which this bounty is granted by Moslem peoples habitually mindful of the humbler creation are those which in Europe are performed partly by the street policeman and partly by conservancy establishments; and it will be convenient to observe this line of division in the next succeeding pieces of description.

II. Watch and Ward

Some fifty years ago that ardent reformer, H.E. Midhat Pasha, in his untempered zeal to put his mark on everything, caused, when Governor-General of the Baghdad Pashalik, the city walls to be demolished, as part of a project for forming Parisian boulevards, not one rood of which has been laid out, as is needless to add, up to the present moment; so much easier is it to destroy than to create. The only vestiges now remaining of the old defences are a few gaunt and tottering gateways, each of which claims its own guard of street dogs —ugly beggars, thoroughly plebeian, not to say blackguardly, of aspect, about the size of small harriers, and of the same reddish-brown colour, much pied with mongrel markings, as the ground that bears them. From being kept strictly to intramural duties, and never taken out like their brethren in many parts of India to help in bringing to bay the grisly wild boar, their fighting form is but moderate. In fact, they are not required to throttle folk, any more than our terriers are to worry foxes, but only to stick to them closely. After sundown they keep up an incessant 'Babel,' or babble, from the varying tones of which it is easy to gather whether they are merely giving tongue promiscuously to proclaim their vigilance, or are dealing with some one in particular. In this as in so many other respects, a list of which would not be uninteresting, East and West stand out in contrast. When the Englishman bars his door and fastens his shutters he either calls in his dog to sleep on a mat beside him, or secures him somewhere within the precincts. The Eastern householder, on the contrary, leaves his canine protectors free to pursue their own strategies and tactics. 'Sleep soundly, O masters, in your private apartments, for are not we, your servants, watching?' is what the dogs without seem to keep saying. Many a time, in riding after dark into the unlighted city, attended by a mounted escort, I have known the street curs to fall so truculently on the heels of the horses as to cause, in spite of spur and bridle, a general stampede back again into the open country. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* perhaps the reader may here feel inclined to inquire. How is it that such packs of furies do not loot the bàzàrs of the town? The explanation is as simple as it is interesting. The Baghdad shop fronts are absolutely open. The goat and mutton carcases are hung where every dog that runs can reach them. In what we should call the windows, trays of savoury cooked meats, piles of bread, and blocks of butter hold out a strong temptation. The Turkish soldier, whose pocket is always supposed to be empty—

of pay, at least—may help himself, as he passes, to a double handful of flour or sweetmeats or tobacco, to meet his immediate requirements, without thought, or word, on either side of payment; but the dogs have no such privilege. The principle of heredity surely is inherent in castigation as in other matters. Time out of mind, in Hàrùnu 'r Rashid's[4] city, the first glance of a dog's eye towards forbidden dainties has been visited with the swift descent on him of a cudgel or a hatchet. Depend upon it, there is nothing like discipline, especially discipline proceeding from a whole community, and exercised upon another whole community; in rude times through the *argumentum ad baculum*, and, later, through the force of public opinion. Ever since the time of the Patriarch Noah—with the Arabs 'Nùh'—as perhaps before it, the dogs of Baghdad have stood very high indeed among the law-abiding communities of the world. Not only have they been taught in each succeeding generation to keep the eighth commandment, but in another important particular they are exemplary. Heaven protect the crates, or bags, of comestibles which are exposed at the doors of the greengrocers and the fruiterers of these islands! Every dog that passes may, if it please him, irrigate them as Gulliver did the burning palace of Lilliput. But if a Baghdad dog were to be guilty of such a misdemeanour, condign punishment, on the Lynch law principle, would be meted out to him on the instant. On one of a series of marches parallel with the Euphrates, I chanced to meet a desert horde whose greyhounds are in high repute. Buying a brace of saplings, I took them on with me, lodging them in the tent, and doing everything that was possible to make them feel at home. Surprising to relate, they obstinately refused both food and water. The remains of a venison pasty seemed at once to attract and to repel them. A pan of water appealed to them even more strongly, but they would not go up to it. After a time a Persian muleteer explained the mystery in a twinkling. No sooner did he upset the water and toss the viands on the ground before them than the silky-eared ones ran in like Trojans, and made up in a few moments for a day's fasting. Accustomed to lap from the river, from irrigational channels, and from sheets of surface water, and reared among people who do not use tables, they had been taught by many a buffet to keep their noses out of cooking-pots and vessels of every description. Use, it is commonly said, is second nature, but in this connection it has to be remembered that to eat and drink from receptacles is even in the human animal a habit that waits on civilisation.

III. Conservancy

There is a good old story current of a midshipman who, when sent up a creek by his captain to report on the manners and customs of the natives, put it all into these four words: 'Manners none;

[4] Arabic form of 'Haroun el Raschid,' meaning 'Aaron, the straight,' *i.e.* orthodox, just, &c.

customs beastly.' *Non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum.* No mere landsman can come within a measurable distance of such a piece of nautical tautness; but the manners, such as they are, of the Baghdad *Canidæ* having now been described, as is hoped not too diffusely, it remains to notice with equal brevity some of their customs —a subject, sooth to say, not over-nice to handle, except in so far as it is no sin for a dog, any more than for a man, to 'labour in his vocation.' If one or more of the premier nations were to commission a body of representative bacteriologists and other *illuminati* to found a colony in which, according to the very newest theories, all the conditions most favourable at once to the genesis, the maturation, and the diffusion of zymotic diseases should be present, they could scarcely make a more ideal centre of the kind imagined than that which lies ready to their hand in the Tigris city. The Americans would say of the climate that it consists of 'samples.' From June to August the heavens are like brass, save when the sandstorm hurtles through the sky, driven by the south-eastern sirocco. At noon the thermometer may stand at 120° Fahr. in verandahs. From soon after sunrise to sunset the well-to-do classes carry on their occupations, and indulge in long siestas, in cellars as damp and dark as charnel-houses. In winter the temperature occasionally falls below freezing-point, heavy rains set in at intervals, and the uneven streets tend to lose themselves in mud-pits and in pools of green and slimy water. Never since the Ark was floated have human beings laid themselves down in closer proximity with the mare and the camel, the milch buffalo and the donkey. The house interiors are wholly dependent on hand carriage for the replenishing of the water-jars. The domestic *cloacæ* are constructed on a principle requiring no plumbers which probably was known to the Old Testament prophets one of whom, Ezra, has his tomb on the Tigris some way below Baghdad. Wells are few and far between. Man and beast alike drink of the great river, which also forms the arterial common sewer of the city; the place where clothes are washed; and the 'Stygian wave' into which is dragged every beast of burden when it is not left to lie where it has fallen. As for the Tigris, its channel where it divides modern Baghdad into two segments is about as broad as that of the Thames at Westminster. On either side substantial dwellings, mosques, and other buildings open on it, or overhang it. In spring, when the snow is loosening its hold of the Armenian and Kurdi mountain-sides, the swollen current runs from bank to bank; but at most seasons a gradual shrinkage is in progress. If all be true that is told us, the muddy bottom, with the water ever receding, the exposed surfaces thick with impurities, and the tropical sun 'sucking up all the infections,'[5] must be a regular hotbed of miasma and pestilence. And yet, *mirabile dictu*, Baghdad is not, as Eastern cities go, unhealthy. In the absence of regular

[5] *The Tempest*, Act ii., sc. 2.

statistics, it is necessary to be guarded; but it is at least certain that for about three-quarters of a century the plague, now so deeply rooted in our own Bombay, has spared it absolutely; and that although it has several times been visited by cholera, the mortality from this cause has fallen short of rather than exceeded the ratio to which India is accustomed.

The connection between all this and the subject proper is near at hand. Let the reader only imagine to himself what the Baghdad of the foregoing slight description would be like without the dogs that scavenge it. What 'Mesopotamia'[6] is in pulpit oratory, 'vehicular traffic' is in all cautionary notices proceeding from corporations; but where the streets are so narrow that two horsemen can hardly pass without touching, and the slightest rumble will disturb the foundations of venerable buildings, city fathers are saved from the temptation of using grand words to stop carriages. To come to the point, Baghdad has no conservancy carts, or, at least, had none in my day, to carry its sweets hither and thither, send them flying in at people's windows, and deposit them in the suburban 'breathing-places.' Refuse animal and vegetable matter is largely disposed of by the dogs, *in situ*; while the mere street sweepings find their way into the furnaces of the public bath-keepers, who, if restricted to fuels sanctioned by *savants*, would have to raise their charges far above the reach of the wayfaring and perspiring classes. It certainly is horrid to watch some grey-muzzled veteran

Or bob-tail tyke, or trundle-tail,[7]

who, because he is 'such a beast,' has secured, so to speak, the corner table, licking his chops over a feast of fat things. It is also shocking to think of such packs of ragamuffins that they can claim kindred with our own Waterloo Cup candidates and flat-coated retrievers, which, wherever they appear, command so much admiration. But, after all, is not the bed rock identical throughout the canine world? Does not the daintiest Skye terrier that ever took his carriage-airings seated on a cushion as *vis-à-vis* to a 'lady of quality' rub himself with infinitely greater gusto on a piece of carrion than on a bundle of the sweetest meadow hay? Nay, is it not so probable as to be almost certain that the noble Alpine mastiffs whose exploits are so famous, when they scrape the snow from dead or dying travellers, are impelled thereto by the self-same instinct as that which teaches their Eastern cousins to turn up the sand-drift over the remains of the fallen mule or camel? An instinct, we all know, can no more be created than it can be eradicated—'*Naturam expellas furca, tamen*

[6] The 'country between the rivers' (a purely geographical expression introduced by the Greeks about the time of Alexander) from the points where the Euphrates and the Tigris break through the Taurus range to, in the south, the so-called 'Median Wall'; where the same rivers, approaching each other, to diverge lower down, enter the rich alluvium of Babylonia, near Hit, the ancient Is.

[7] *King Lear*, Act III., sc. 6.

usque recurret'—but we also know that one and the same instinct admits of being directed into ever so many different channels by means of education.

IV

Like the Irish post-boy's 'trot for the avenue,' a special representation has been reserved for the finish. It was stated at the outset that a notable fact of canine natural history would be brought forward in the sequel; and this is the proper place for it. During a residence of ten years—1882–92—in Baghdad, as H.M.'s Consul-General, I never saw or heard of a case of madness in the dog; and on inquiry it transpired that the 'oldest inhabitant,' equally with the surgeon-major of the Bombay army who during many years had been attached as medical officer to the consulate, had the same story to tell. This fact seemed so remarkable as to deserve mention in a work on Arabian topics which I brought out later;[8] and the hope was that some of the authorities who are interested in the subjects of *rabies* and hydrophobia would notice the reference. It is, of course, possible that during the years that have passed since 1892—'alas! how time escapes,' as Cowper says—cases of *rabies* have occurred on the Tigris; but, even so, the long antecedent period of immunity is not to be forgotten. All that will here be attempted is to note down a few facts, the task of drawing inferences being left to the scientific. Speaking, firstly, of the risks of the disease being imported, not only is the desert round Baghdad the habitat of the wolf, the fox, and the jackal, but there are few parts of the world, between London and Hong Kong, from which pet dogs are not brought occasionally by military officers of the Osmanli, by consuls, and by travellers. In ten years I saw two packs of foxhounds imported to Baghdad from England, besides a goodly number of German boarhounds, Dandie Dinmonts, and dogs of other nationalities. And then, with regard to the self-development of *rabies*, if the possibility of such a thing apart from bites be granted, the conditions of canine existence in Baghdad are as above glanced at. The extremes of tropical, or sub-tropical, heat can, it is evident, be experienced without madness appearing, though what the effect would be were access to the Tigris at the same time wanting is a point only determinable by experiment. Precisely the same remark is applicable to the habit of preying upon offal; and, indeed, one rather common, if somewhat random, theory is, that a free supply of this the natural food of the dog, together with an open-air life, and the complete absence of restriction on acts of reproduction, is not altogether unconnected with the exemption which the dogs of Baghdad would appear to enjoy from the greatest curse of their species.

W. TWEEDIE.

[8] *The Arabian Horse: His Country and People.* Messrs. William Blackwood & Sons: 1894.

JAPANESE EDUCATION

In Japanese schools, when masters and pupils assemble in the hall of the school, at the beginning of a school session or term, to celebrate the New Year's day or other fête days, or Commemoration days and on Graduation days, in fact in all school functions, and likewise in many other functions connected with education, it is usual to commence the proceedings with the reading of the Imperial Rescript on Education. This is no empty ceremony; the reader, who is usually the principal, feels that he is giving the living words of his Majesty the Emperor; the assembly stands up, and when the reading is over, all bow in profound reverence, as if they had been delivered by the Emperor in person. A copy of this Rescript is distributed from the Department of Education to every school in the Empire, whether established and maintained by the central government, local governments, or by private individuals or corporations; those for the central government schools being actually signed by the Emperor. This copy of the Rescript, together with the photographic portraits of the Emperor and the Empress, which are distributed on application from the Imperial household to all schools above the higher primary grade maintained by the central or local governments, are kept in a special place in the school and carefully guarded. There have been instances when the principal or a teacher of a school saved them at the risk of his life from the flames, when the school-house was burnt down by conflagration; such deeds are not officially encouraged, but there can be no doubt that they make most profound impression on the minds of children.

I think I cannot do better in this Inaugural Address to the course of lectures on Japanese Education than say something about this Rescript, and explain the circumstances leading to its issue in 1890, little more than sixteen years ago.

I shall begin with the translation, which I may say has been made specially for this course of lectures. One of the first things I did, when I accepted the invitation of the University of London to lecture before an English audience on Japanese education, was to look out for a good English translation of the Rescript. There were

several translations, but none of them was satisfactory, to my mind, some being absolutely erroneous, while others were paraphrases rather than translations, therefore conveying sometimes more, sometimes less, than the original. I mention this because some of you may have seen these translations. So I attempted a new translation myself, which I published in papers and magazines, inviting criticisms and even asking for new translations. I also got Mr. Makino, the present Minister of Education, to interest himself in the matter; meetings were held in his official residence of those interested in the matter, amongst whom the names of Barons Suyematsu and Kaneko, Professors Inouye, Nitobe, Takakusu, and Kanda may be known to you. After a long and warm discussion a draft was made, of which I took charge, and after consulting some English and American professors a final draft was obtained. I have here a copy which came from the printers just the day before my departure from Japan. Mr. Makino told me that he was going to present a copy to his Majesty the Emperor at the earliest opportunity. So this may be said to be almost an official translation. It is as follows :—

THE IMPERIAL RESCRIPT ON EDUCATION.

Know ye, Our subjects :

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education. Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore, advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true

in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may all thus attain to the same virtue.

The 30th day of the 10th month of the 23rd year of Meiji.

(The 30th of October, 1890.)

(Imperial Sign Manual. Imperial Seal.)

I fear that, however we may translate it, the translation will not convey the same message to you that the original does to a Japanese; in fact, it may be said that our whole moral and civic education consists in so imbuing our children with the spirit of the Rescript that it forms a part of our national life. The cardinal virtues which are pre-eminently put forward are loyalty to the Emperor, with which is identified patriotism to the State, and filial piety, including therein not only duties due to one's parents, but to ancestors in general; all the rest may be said to be regarded as an outcome of these two. The Rescript admonishes us to certain rules of conduct, that we may 'thereby guard and maintain the prosperity of the Imperial throne,' for we shall thus not only be good and faithful subjects of the Emperor, but 'render illustrious the best traditions of our forefathers'—*i.e.* we shall so fulfil duties that we owe to the Emperor and the State and to one's parents and ancestors, for, according to Confucius, 'to keep whole the body that you have received from your parents is the beginning of filial piety; to attain fame and make known your parents is the end of it.' Indeed, I think you must have noticed the repeated references to the Imperial ancestors and to the forefathers, thus: 'Our Imperial ancestors have founded the Empire on a basis broad and everlasting'; 'Our subjects, ever united in loyalty and filial piety, have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof'; and again, 'The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by our Imperial ancestors,' and so on. This repeated reference to ancestors is characteristic of our nationality; indeed, it is so stated explicitly in the Rescript itself: 'Our Imperial ancestors have founded . . . This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also *lies the source of Our education.*'

The relation between the Imperial House and the people, intimately connected with the ancestor worship or the reverence for ancestors, is, indeed, the basis of our education. The very way in which this Rescript has been at once received as the true and adequate basis of our moral education, and the reverence in which it is held, show sufficiently clearly the special nature of this relation, which has existed without interruption for over twenty-five centuries, according to our historical records, although our chronology for the

first ten centuries can scarcely be regarded as authentic. Our two oldest historical works extant are the *Kojiki*, or *Records of Ancient Matters*, completed in A.D. 712, and the *Nihongi*, or *Chronicles of Japan*, completed eight years later, both being compiled by the Imperial order from the traditions and materials then extant, the older parts being, of course, entirely traditional. Both begin with mythological accounts of the separation of the heaven and the earth, the first coming down to A.D. 628, and the other to 697. According to these traditions, the goddess Ama-Terasu-O-Mi-Kami (literally Heaven-shining-Great-Deity or, we may say, Great Goddess of Celestial Light), who reigned in the Taka-Ma-ga-Hara (literally Plain of High Heaven), sent down her grandson (Ni-Ni-Gi-no-Mikoto) to rule over the Land-of-Luxuriant-Rice-Ears, *i.e.* Japan, with these words: 'This is the land of which my descendants shall be the lords. Do thou proceed thither, and govern the land. Go! *The prosperity of thy dynasty shall be coeval with heaven and earth.*' I wish to call your attention specially to these last words. You remember that they are quoted in the Rescript; they are words ever present to the minds of a Japanese and continually occurring in our literature. She also gave him a jewel, a sword, and a mirror, which form the three divine treasures of the Empire. Of the mirror in particular she said: 'Regard this mirror exactly as if it were my spirit, and reverence (or worship) it as if reverencing me.' This mirror is now enshrined in the Temple at Ise, whereunto tens of thousands of pilgrims flock every year from every part of the country, and to which on every occasion of great national importance the Emperor either goes himself or sends a special messenger to announce the event. In the Imperial palace in Tōkyō, also, there is a shrine, called the Kashikodokoro, or the Sanctuary, where is deposited a facsimile of the sacred mirror, made in the reign of the Emperor Sujin, B.C. 92, when the original mirror was first moved into a separate shrine, lest its sanctity should be diminished by being kept in the same building as the living. Here on festival days the Emperor and the Empress, the Imperial family and high officials do worship to the spirit of the first of the Imperial ancestors. When an official is sent on a mission abroad, he will, after the farewell audience of the Emperor, be made to do reverence here. Again, in every ordinary Japanese household there is a Kami-dana, or god-shelf, in the centre of which is placed a Taima, which is a part of the offerings made at the Shrine of Ise, and which is distributed thence to every household in the Empire at the end of each year. On this altar are also placed, besides the Taima representing the shrine at Ise, representations of local tutelary deities and other special Shinto shrines, and offerings of rice and saké are placed and lights lighted every evening. Thus Ama-Terasu-O-Mi-Kami, the first Imperial ancestor, is worshipped throughout the whole Empire.

Well, to return to her grandson, sent to rule over Japan, he is said

to have settled in the present province of Hyūga, in the island of Kyūshū, whence his two great-grandsons sallied forth on an expedition to subjugate the whole land. After several years of hard fighting, during which the elder was killed, the younger succeeded in establishing his authority over a district in the neighbourhood of the modern province of Yamato, and ascended the throne in B.C. 660, according to the *Nihongi*, although, as I said before, the chronology cannot be relied upon. Such is the account handed down to us by the traditions; ethnological investigations alone can determine where the High Heavenly Plain was, whence we Japanese have come.

From this first Emperor, now known as Emperor Jimmu, there has been an unbroken line of descent to the present reigning Emperor. This unique character of our Imperial dynasty, and the fact that we regard all Japanese, with the exception of some few naturalised Coreans and Chinese and subjugated Ainos, as descended either from the Imperial House or from those who came over with it from the High Heavenly Plain, may be considered as constituting the special character of our nationality; our nation is, as it were, one family, of which the Emperor is the head or patriarch, and it has been so since the first foundation of the Empire. Never, during the whole course of our history, has there been a single serious instance of a subject presuming to attempt to place himself on the throne, and never during that time have we been conquered by a foreign foe. The single occasion on which we were seriously threatened by a foreign invasion, previously to the Meiji era, was towards the latter part of the thirteenth century, when Kublai Khan, having conquered China, sent embassy after embassy for several years to induce the Japanese to accept his suzerainty. But no reply was sent to these messages, which were regarded as insults. On one occasion a large fleet of 150 vessels was sent, and there was a great fighting, in which the invaders by their guns and by their superior tactics caused great havoc among the Japanese army; but the Chinese general was wounded, and a heavy gale arising the invaders could not follow up their advantages. Taught by experience, the Japanese spent a few years of respite they had in building a line of fortresses along the coast of Kyūshū for some hundred miles; and when, in 1281, Kublai, exasperated by the stubborn attitude of the Japanese and bent seriously on conquering them by force, sent a large force of 100,000 soldiers, together with a contingent of 10,000 Coreans, they could not effect a landing on the mainland for more than sixty days—that being the tactics adopted by the Japanese—until finally, a heavy autumnal gale arising, the whole Chinese fleet was scattered, and those who survived the tempest were killed by the Japanese; so that it is said that only three men out of 100,000 escaped to carry the tale back to China. This is spoken of popularly as Ise-no-Kami-Kaze, or the divine gale of Ise, it being supposed that

the goddess sent the tempest to protect the land governed by her descendants.

Among the 122 Emperors from Jimmu to the present sovereign there have been many specially distinguished for their prominent virtues, for their good administration, for their military prowess, for their literary taste, and so on; but we may say that there was none who was not animated by a high sense of responsibility as the ruler of the land and by love of the people entrusted to their care. And the people have always regarded them with peculiar feelings of reverence and loyalty. It is true that their power was usurped sometimes by the Court nobles, and afterwards, during the last 700 years previous to the restoration of Meiji, by the military class, who practically ruled the land. Certainly, Samurais owed their loyalty in the first instance to their chiefs, and so, also, common people to the lords of the land; but even during this period the Imperial House, devoid of any real power as it was, never failed to receive reverence and veneration, not only from the people in general, but from the military chiefs themselves. Only the Emperor could bestow Court ranks or official titles, which, though nominal, were much coveted; many circumstances could be cited to show this attitude towards the Imperial House.

This reverence of the Imperial House is intimately connected with the ancestor worship. Our primitive Shintoism, before the introduction of Buddhism and Chinese philosophy, so far as can be gathered from the above-mentioned *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, was preeminently worship of ancestors, together with some admixture of nature worship; already in the fifth and sixth centuries the great shrines at Ise, Izumo, Atsuta, etc., erected for the worship of deified ancestors, were in existence. These gods were supposed to be guardians of the land, and on important state occasions they were consulted or their protection was specially asked for. Towards the end of the sixth century Buddhism and Chinese civilisation began to be introduced, at first through Corea, and then directly from China. It was not the common people who became first converts to the new religion, but the Imperial Court; and there ensued a fierce struggle between the conservative party, who maintained that the worship of foreign gods would anger the old gods of Japan and bring calamities on the land, and the party of reform, who were for adopting the new and, as they thought, superior civilisation. This was not a religious struggle in the sense that would be usually understood by the term; it was rather a political struggle between two powerful Court parties, one progressive and the other conservative. Finally the Buddhist party was victorious, owing to the aid of the famous Shōtoku Taishi, the regent and heir-presumptive to the throne, a great Chinese scholar, deeply imbued with the spirit of Buddhism, who saw in it and in Confucian ethics the best means of elevating the moral condition of the

people; he is still regarded, as his name indicates, as a prince of most saintly virtues. Most of the subsequent Emperors and the Imperial family and the nobles of the Court were zealously in favour of the new religion; but it is to be borne carefully in mind that this zeal for Buddhism by no means precluded their worshipping at the shrines of their ancestors—*i.e.* of the ancient gods of the land. Indeed, these were several times consulted by the Court whether the new religion should be introduced or not. Thus, during the regency of the Prince Shotoku; just mentioned (597–621), while on the one hand laws and orders were issued enjoining people to embrace Buddhism and encouraging the erection of Buddhist temples, on the other hand a Rescript was issued insisting upon the reverence being paid to the ancient gods; and the Prince, with the whole Court, is said to have held a high festival in their honour; and the same Prince, in conjunction with the head of the Buddhist party, Soga-no-Umako, was the first to have the traditions of old Japan taken down in writing and compiled, although, unfortunately, this compilation was lost afterwards at the time of the downfall of the Soga family. The Emperor Shōmu (724–748), one of the most devoted followers of Buddhism, sent messengers to the shrines at Ise and Usa when the Coreans sent insulting embassies, and on one occasion, when the land was desolated by a plague, went himself to Ise and sent messengers to other important shrines to pray for the abatement of the scourge. There were many able Buddhist priests at this time, and in order to reconcile their religion with the spirit of ancestor worship, which they could not hope to overcome, they maintained that the ancient gods (*i.e.* the ancestors and great men) were but different impersonations of Buddha, that appeared to lead the people of Japan to the ultimate goal of Buddhism. It is recorded that when Emperor Shōmu, whom I have just mentioned as a devotee of Buddhism, was about to erect a temple to the Daibutsu, or the great Buddha that visitors to Nara, the ancient capital of Japan, may still see, he sent a Buddhist priest to the shrine at Ise to ask the will of the goddess, who returned, saying that the goddess was propitious, for the Rushanabutsu, that the image represented, was none other than the goddess herself; not satisfied with this, he sent a noble of the Court for a confirmation of this. Gradually the Buddhist priests elaborated this doctrine of the impersonations; and there being many able men among them, they gradually appropriated almost all the Shinto shrines and became ministers at these shrines, as well as at pure Buddhist temples. Thus in Japan Buddhism became associated with the ancestor worship, and so it spread rapidly among the people, which it would not have done, probably, had it been opposed to the ancestor worship. Buddhism thus absorbed, as it were, the Shintoism until the revival of the Shintoism, or rather the rise of Neo-Shintoism, in the middle of the eighteenth century, a period which was most remarkable for its

reaction against old traditions and schools in almost every branch of intellectual, moral and artistic activity. At the beginning of the Meiji era all the Shinto shrines were 'purified,' and Buddhism and Shintoism were entirely separated, at least officially.

What I want to bring out is that Buddhism, which, if not actually opposed to ancestor worship, does not essentially hold it, had to modify itself so as not to come into conflict with the deep-rooted belief of the people, and adapt itself to the national practice, and came to encourage the ancestor worship. And thus the worship of ancestors has continued from the oldest times to the present day to be the most powerful factor in moulding our national character. Nor does the introduction of the Western civilisation, which has wrought such changes in other matters, seem to have had any effect on this. At the present day, in every Japanese household, in addition to the Kamidana, which I mentioned as a sort of domestic shrine, there is another sacred place, called Butsudan, or Buddhist altar, containing cenotaphs bearing the posthumous Buddhist names of the ancestors; or, if the family be of pure Shinto persuasion, a second Kamidana, containing cenotaphs of the ancestors of the family. There are certain festival days, when offerings are made and family graves are visited and decorated; at the beginning and the end of each year, just as people go about visiting the living, so the graves of the ancestors are visited and offerings of flowers and incense made. So, also, if a man goes on a long journey, he will generally go to take leave of his ancestors' graves, just as he would go to the living; if he lives in a distant place, he will often go long journeys to visit them. Thus, to a Japanese, the spirit of his ancestors is ever present in all the events of his life.

You will, of course, see the intimate relation that I said existed between the ancestor worship and the reverence towards the Imperial House. Japanese do not worship at the shrine of the Imperial ancestors, such as that at Ise, simply because they are the shrines of the ancestors of the Emperor, but also because they are the shrines of the sovereigns of our ancestors. The relation between the Imperial House and the people is not merely a relation between the reigning sovereign and his subjects, but also one between his ancestors and our ancestors for generations, from the very beginning of the Empire. This relation is clearly assumed in the Rescript on education. Or take the words of the preamble to the Constitution promulgated, as you are aware no doubt, in 1889, as a free gift from the Emperor to his people:

> Having, by virtue of the glories of Our Ancestors, ascended the throne of a lineal succession unbroken for ages eternal; remembering that Our beloved subjects are the very same that have been favoured with the benevolent care and affectionate vigilance of Our Ancestors, and desiring to promote their welfare and give development to their moral and intellectual faculties; and hoping to maintain the prosperity and progress of the State, in concert with Our people and with their support, We hereby promulgate, in pursuance of Our

Imperial Rescript of the 12th day of the 10th month of the 14th year of Meiji (1881), a fundamental law of State to exhibit the principles by which We are to be guided in Our conduct, and to point out to what Our Descendants and Our subjects and their descendants are for ever to conform. The rights of sovereignty of the State We have inherited from Our Ancestors, and We shall bequeath them to Our Descendants. . . .

Again, in the Imperial Speech on the same occasion are the following words:

The Imperial Founder of Our House and Our other Imperial Ancestors, by the help and support of the forefathers of Our subjects, laid the foundation of Our Empire upon a basis which is to last forever. That this brilliant achievement embellishes the annals of Our country is due to the glorious virtues of Our Sacred Imperial Ancestors, and to the loyalty and bravery of Our subjects, their love of their country and their public spirit. Considering that Our subjects are the descendants of the loyal and good subjects of Our Imperial Ancestors, We doubt not but that Our subjects will be guided by Our views, and will sympathise with all Our endeavours, and that, harmoniously co-operating together, they will share with us Our hope of making manifest the glory of Our country, both at home and abroad, and of securing for ever the stability of the work bequeathed to Us by Our Imperial Ancestors.

These words, I think, will be sufficient to illustrate what I have said about the relation between the Imperial House and the people. Truly, as a recent Japanese author on the awakening of Japan has remarked, 'that sacred conception (Mikado) is the thought inheritance of Japan. Mythology has consecrated it, history has endeared it, and poetry has idealised it.'

I hope that what I have been saying will give you some idea of the message that the Rescript conveys to us, and how it serves as the basis of our moral education. It remains for me to explain how this Rescript came to be issued. For that I shall have to go back to the beginning of the Meiji era. In April 1868, the year after the accession to the throne of the present Emperor, one of the first acts after the real power of government was restored into the Imperial hands was to swear solemnly the following memorable oath, known in our history as 'the Imperial Oath of five articles.' The five articles are as follows:

(1) Deliberative assemblies shall be established, and all measures of government shall be decided by public opinion.

(2) All classes, high and low, shall unite in vigorously carrying out the plan of the Government.

(3) Officials, civil and military, and all common people shall, as far as possible, be allowed to fulfil their just desires, so that there may not be any discontent among them.

(4) Uncivilised customs of former times shall be broken through, and everything shall be based upon the just and equitable principle of nature.

(5) Knowledge shall be sought for throughout the whole world, so that the welfare of the Empire may be promoted.

Desiring to carry out a reform without parallel in the annals of Our country, We ourselves hereby take the initiative, and swear to the deities of heaven and earth to adopt the above fundamental principles of national government, so as

to establish thereby the security and prosperity of the people. We call upon you all to make combined and strenuous efforts to carry them out.'

These five articles, so solemnly enunciated by the Emperor before the Court assembled in Shishinden, or the throne-room of the old palace at Kyōto, have been the fundamental principles according to which the government has since been carried out.

In accordance with this oath, radical changes followed in rapid succession. The most important of these was the abolition of the feudal system. In 1869 the great Daimyōs of Satsuma, Chōshū, Hizen, and Tosa memorialised the Throne that it was just and proper that all lands and people of the Empire should come under the direct control of the Emperor; other Daimyōs followed their example; thereupon all the Daimyōs were summoned to a consultation; and in consequence of their recommendation all the fiefs hitherto held by them were restored to the Emperor, the Daimyōs receiving one-tenth of the revenues of their former fiefs; Samurais, the old retainers of Daimyōs, but now directly subject to the Emperor, also received pensions. These pensions were afterwards commuted into national bonds. Thus the great feudal nobles voluntarily gave up their territories and their power, even of life and death, over the people in those territories which they had held for centuries because it was just and proper. Many measures were then carried out which it would be difficult to carry out at any other time. It is not to be wondered at that the Government and the people, in their anxiety to introduce Western civilisation and bring themselves up to the level of the Western nations in power and prosperity, sometimes threw overboard things that it would have been well to keep, and often tried to adopt Western methods wholesale, without troubling to consider whether they would be suitable to our national characteristics or not, or taking care to adapt them to our special needs. Just to give one instance from our educational system, when the first normal school was opened in Tōkyō, in 1872, and an American engaged to teach the method of instruction in primary schools, the Minister of Education gave express instructions to the American teacher that he was to give instruction exactly as he would in America, and not to think of modifying so as to adapt his teaching to Japanese. The chief aim at that time was rather to cut away from the past, or, in the words of the Imperial oath, 'to break through the uncivilised customs of former times,' 'to seek for knowledge throughout the whole world,' and to construct a new system based 'upon the just and equitable principle of nature.' Perhaps if they had stopped in those days to consider deliberately, and spent time in adjusting and adapting before adopting, we might have been spared some errors, but it is doubtful whether we should have been able, on the whole, to make such advances as we have. As we were willing to let old things go, so we did not hesitate to change the newly adopted if we found that they did not suit us; and as we

gradually came to have a better and truer knowledge of the Western civilisation, of its inner spirit rather than its outward form, so also we came back to a better appreciation of what we have inherited from the old, happily not too late for us to attempt to retain what was best in them and blend them with what was best in the new.

Thus it was in our moral teaching. In old feudal days a large portion of the time of the youths of the Samurai class was spent in learning the arts of fencing, archery, use of spears, riding, jūjutsu, swimming, etc., which were considered necessary as a part of their military training; while their literary education consisted almost entirely in reading books in Chinese (not necessarily Chinese, but written in Chinese), principally on philosophy and history. These books were studied chiefly with the view to intellectual and moral training; they were taught thereby their responsibility as members of the ruling class, and how to discharge this responsibility; there they learned the cause of the rise, decline, and fall of States and families, there they read of the deeds of great and good men. By such means, with precepts and examples, the spirit of loyalty to their lords and filial piety to their parents, of reverence for the Imperial House and veneration for their ancestors, was inculcated. In fact, in those days learning meant intellectual culture and moral training. With the other classes it was the same, only in a lesser degree, as they would not be called upon to rule over others.

When, in 1872, the first education code was promulgated, there was no special provision made for higher moral training, not because morals or moral teaching was regarded as unimportant, but because necessity for such was not clearly perceived, learning being, as I have just stated, regarded as synonymous with the intellectual and moral training. Just as they were formerly given books in Chinese on philosophy and history, so now young men were often given to read indiscriminately works of Rousseau, Montesquieu, Mill, Spencer, and so on. Effects of such books on the minds of youths who, according to the spirit of the time, were apt to look down upon everything old as good for nothing, and eager to climb to the heights of Western civilisation, may be imagined. In 1880 we find the Department of Education issuing instructions to the local prefects to prohibit the use of text-books likely to be injurious to the morals or to disturb public order, or otherwise deleterious to education. This was but a negative step; there was felt a need for a basis of moral teaching; we seemed to have cut loose from our old moorings and to be drifting away, no one could say whither. Then it was that some who did not themselves believe in Christianity nevertheless thought that it should be adopted as the basis of our moral teaching; others talked wildly about a new religion; some were for returning to the old teachings of Confucius. But the old standard of devotion to duty, of loyalty and filial piety, had been maintained by the older men,

and home influences were powerful enough to keep the rising generation in the same path. Gradually, as I have remarked before, we came to the better and truer appreciation of our inheritance from the former days; and when, in October 1890, the Imperial Rescript was issued, we felt that the whole question was settled, and thenceforth there was a firm basis for our moral teaching. It was not anything new; it was a clear enunciation, as the Rescript says, 'of the teaching bequeathed by our Imperial ancestors, to be observed alike by their descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places.'

D. KIKUCHI.

HOW LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS WORKED IN IRELAND

THE admission of Mr. Balfour that the Irish Councils Bill is incapable, by any legitimate process of development, of being turned into the irreducible minimum demanded by the Nationalists was received by the Liberal party with almost hysterical expressions of relief. The rank and file in the House of Commons, writhing under such a castigation as Mr. Balfour alone can give—and oppressed by the nightmare of having to defend the Government proposals in the country—gratefully welcomed this definition of the measure as a text for their autumn meetings. The Radical Press revelled next day in an apparent admission that the Bill involves no direct jeopardy to the Act of Union. Perhaps, from an electioneering point of view, the phrase was a mistake. The leader of the Opposition forgets the unscrupulous ingenuity of those who compile the elective literature of the Liberal party—and we shall doubtless see that the same hands who were responsible for the famous Chinese slavery posters will find scope for their particular genius in separating, for purposes of quotation, the phrase in question from the context in the speech. To those, however, who are concerned with statecraft rather than election leaflets it must be apparent that Mr. Balfour's line of attack was the wise one. The Bill is not Home Rule. 'However great may be the objections to the scheme from a constitutional point of view—however much we may be opposed to a complete violation of the fundamental principle of the Constitution that the British Parliament is to have control of the spending of moneys voted by the British taxpayer—the Bill as sketched out by Mr. Birrell cannot be said to affect the *legislative* supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. The main interest of the measure—apart from the constitutional principle to which reference has been made and the issues raised by the relative positions of the Chief Secretary and the Lord Lieutenant—must centre not in the Imperial Parliament, but in Ireland herself. The danger for those who are opposed to Home Rule, as Mr. Balfour—with his power of going to the very heart of a political issue—pointed out in his speech, lies not in the immediate effect of the proposals, but in the situation which they must inevitably create.

There are more ways of killing a cat than by drowning it; and to turn a bull-terrier loose in the stable-yard (if there is no escape for the cat) may be equally efficacious. This would seem to be the method adopted by the present Ministry. Attempts have been made to drown that cat before. It has, however, invariably made its reappearance. Mr. Birrell has therefore reverted in desperation to the bull-terrier expedient, and these obnoxious individuals—the Irish subjects of the Crown who are loyal to the British Constitution—are to be worried in a Dublin back-yard until such time as they cease resistance or until the British public, wearied of the noise, step in with a bludgeon to give them the *coup de grâce* or beat off the terrier.

In view of this 'change of venue' on the part of Liberals it is only natural that considerable prominence was given in the debate to the lessons afforded by the working of the Local Government Act. By the constitution of the proposed Council the administrative authority will be vested, so far as the transferred departments are concerned, not, as hitherto, in a minister responsible to Parliament, but in representatives elected on the same basis as the existing local authorities.

Under these circumstances an illuminating sidelight is thrown upon the Government scheme by the past history of these bodies. The same electors will control the new Council. The same class of representatives will be returned. The administration of the central body will be carried out in the same spirit, and with the same objects, as the administration of the units of local government has been in the past.

There must be many who will doubt if such an unworkable scheme —so unsatisfactory to all parties concerned—as that which has been put forward by the Government is ever destined to pass the House of Commons. In case, however, the Bill ever reaches its further stages, it may be of practical use to those who are interested in the Irish problem if I endeavour to sketch out the leading characteristics of Irish local government since the passing of the Act of 1898.

I.

When introducing the Local Government Act of 1898—an Act which abolished the Grand Jury system of Ireland and gave to that country a system of popular local government equivalent to that existing in the United Kingdom—Mr. Gerald Balfour expressed the hope that fair representation, proportioned to their position, education, and unquestioned great experience of country administration, would continue to be given to the resident gentry in Ireland, and that the benefit of their services would not be lost under the new conditions which were to take the place of the pre-existing form of local administration.

This hope was re-echoed by Mr. Redmond in statements which are

of peculiar interest at a time when his honeyed utterances about the interests of the minority are being quoted by his Liberal allies. He spoke as follows :

> The grand juries, owing to their constitution, have been to a large extent failures, but it would be absurd to deny that on every one of the juries in Ireland there have been country gentlemen who have shown the greatest aptitude for business, the greatest industry, and the greatest ability; and I say it would be a monstrous thing if by working the elections for these county councils upon narrow sectarian or political lines, men of that class were excluded from the service of their country on these boards.—Parliamentary Debates, the 21st of February, 1898.

A month later the leader of the Nationalist party repeated these views in the House of Commons, promising hearty support to a spirit of toleration, both on his own behalf and on that of his followers.

> Whatever influence my friends and I have in Ireland would certainly be used to obtain for this scheme a fair and successful working. Our desire will be to work this Bill on fair and tolerant lines so far as we can. No man's politics or religion will be allowed to be a bar to him if he desires to serve his country on one of the new bodies.—Parliamentary Debates, the 21st of March, 1898.

Alas! the expectations thus raised were doomed to speedy disappointment. So soon as the Bill became an Act, the mask was thrown off. The gospel of peace preached in the House of Commons gave place to a declaration of war on the hillsides of Connemara. The Nationalist leaders, quick to observe the value of the weapon which had been placed in their hands, did not hesitate to use it. The decree of ostracism went forth against all those for whom toleration had been promised. Electors were urged 'to use these bodies for political purposes, for the purpose of forwarding the cause of Irish freedom,' 'to never elect the supporters of foreign rule to administer local government,' and 'to let it be known beforehand that no man need come and ask for their vote unless he had previously joined the United Irish League.' So successful was the appeal of the Nationalist leaders—so perfect is Nationalist organisation—that three years later Mr. John Redmond, who had declared in the House of Commons that 'it would be a monstrous thing if the elections for these county councils were to be worked on narrow sectarian or political lines,' was able to boast in a speech at Cork that '*the county and district councils to-day form a network of Nationalist organisations all over Ireland.*'

I append a return showing the political complexion of the first and third councils: the latter being the bodies at present in office. These figures have been already quoted publicly on more than one occasion; but as they are so significant, perhaps I may be allowed to once more draw attention to them. An examination of this return establishes, in the most convincing manner, the truth of the assertion that, 'so far from exercising the new powers conferred upon them

in a spirit of moderation and toleration, the local government electors in Ireland—outside certain counties of Ulster—have virtually excluded from the councils every candidate of the class who differed from them in politics and creed.

It will be seen that the representation retained by this class on the first councils, outside the six counties named, was that which, with few exceptions, was already secured to it by the system of nomination contained in a special provision of the Act of 1898, which provided for the addition to each of the first councils of a nominated element consisting of three grand jury representatives. By this means a small share of representation upon the councils was ensured to the county-gentleman class for a period of at least three years. The existence of the nominated element came to an end, however, with the first councils, which went out of office in 1902.

1900		1906	
Unionists	271	Unionists	134
Nationalists	804	Nationalists	801
		Devolutionists	6
		Indefinite	10
Total number in Ireland	1,075	Total number in Ireland	951

Omit the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Down, Fermanagh, Londonderry, and Tyrone: the figures for the remaining twenty-seven counties would be:

1900		1906	
Unionists	131	Unionists	23
Nationalists	754	Nationalists	747
		Devolutionists	5
		Indefinite	5
Total number	885	Total number	780

If it is borne in mind, in connection with the above statistics, that in the returns for 1900 each council contained three of the old grand jury representatives, the *decrease* in the representatives of the minority on the existing councils is most marked. I may add that in the present state of political representation fourteen counties have not a single Unionist on any county council, while in eight more the minority are represented by one member in each. The seven counties of Munster have only two Unionists in all, and there are a like number in the five counties of Connaught.

What is true in regard to the county councils is true also in regard to the other local authorities.

District councils, boards of guardians, asylums boards—one and all—outside certain counties of Ulster, form part and parcel of Mr. Redmond's 'network of Nationalist organisation.'

Unfortunately I have not got the electoral statistics for the district councils, but the composition of these bodies is indicated by the *ex officio* members of the county councils—*i.e.* the *chairmen* of the

district councils; and I find, as regards these, that in twenty-eight counties and ridings (including two ridings of Cork and Tipperary) there are on the existing councils a total of 172 chairmen of district councils, only five of whom are Unionists.

If we turn to the asylums boards the proportions are equally striking. I have before me a return for eight counties in the south and west of Ireland. Previous to the Act of 1898 some ninety Unionist members were serving upon these bodies. Now there are seven. These are not specially selected counties, but are typical of three-fourths of Ireland. An examination of the political constitution, past and present, of the Irish local bodies demonstrates the complete success of the Nationalist leaders in their policy of excluding from public life all save their own nominees—who are one and all elected, not to do practical work for the prosperity of the country, but, in the words of Mr. Dillon, to 'forward the cause of Irish freedom.'

II.

The quotations from speeches given above—which are mere samples of a mass of similar utterances—serve to show that the local bodies are admittedly for the most part mere pawns in the Home Rule game. An examination of the manner in which their 'patronage' is bestowed exhibits one of their methods by which that game is played. Not merely is a man who happens to be a Unionist excluded from all participation in local public life, but he is also debarred—except in very rare instances—from employment in the service of the local bodies. There is, be it here remarked, a fundamental difference between legitimate political patronage (such as the appointment of an alderman whose politics are those of a majority and who is in other respects a suitable person) and the illegitimate promotion of the interests of your own supporters apart from personal qualifications. The former is the system recognised in England; the latter is the practice of the branches of the United Irish League, which in Nationalist Ireland masquerade under the name of local institutions. Only too frequently the best qualifications which a candidate can possess for any appointment within their gift are that he should be a pronounced advocate of separation and a violent anti-Englander.

Let a man be imprisoned for cowardly intimidation, and directly he is released he will, in all probability, be rewarded by employment under a local body. The following table will show the extent to which these tactics of exclusion are adopted. It is, I believe, a complete and accurate return of appointments of Unionists to any official position made by nineteen county councils since the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898. One word of explanation is necessary, however, in connection with the remarks contained in the last column. A certain number of officials were transferred from the grand juries. These for the most part have been retained, since dismissal means that

the local authority have to pension the official whose appointment they terminate. Thus a certain number of Unionists have doubtless remained in the employment of the county councils. When, however, an opportunity arises of making a *fresh* appointment, the vacant post is never given to a Unionist; and the reason is, as all Ireland knows in spite of barefaced statements to the contrary made by members of the Government, that it is because he refuses to sacrifice his political and religious convictions to his personal interest.

RETURN OF APPOINTMENTS MADE BY NATIONALIST COUNTY COUNCILS IN IRELAND OF UNIONISTS TO ANY OFFICIAL POSITIONS SINCE THE PASSING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

County	Population in 1901. Roman Catholics	Protestants	Others	Appointments of Protestant Unionists	Other Unionists	Remarks
Carlow	33,399	4,307	42	None	None	County and assistant surveyors from grand jury
Cork	365,724	36,913	1,974	„	„	Seven Unionists in minor posts from grand jury
Kerry	160,511	5,006	209	„	„	Two clerks from grand jury
King's	53,806	6,258	123	One	„	Assistant secretary appointed county surveyor from grand jury
Leitrim	62,860	6,462	21	None	„	Solicitor from grand jury
Louth	60,171	5,494	155	„	„	Secretary from grand jury
Meath	62,643	4,790	84	„	„	
Monaghan	54,757	19,479	371	„	„	
Queen's	50,599	6,664	154	One	„	Scotch Unionist appointed agricultural instructor
Roscommon	99,085	2,623	83	None	„	
Sligo	76,144	7,595	342	„	„	Secretary from grand jury
Tipperary, N. & S. Ridings	150,332	9,727	173	One	„	Medical superintendent of asylum appointed. South Riding county surveyor, and one rate-collector from grand jury
Wexford	95,435	8,472	197	None	„	County surveyor and solicitor from grand jury
Westmeath	56,673	4,841	115	„	„	Assistant county surveyor from grand jury
Wicklow	48,083	12,470	271	„	„	Secretary from grand jury
Clare	110,334	2,241	31	One	„	A Unionist deputy road surveyor was appointed
Longford	42,742	3,862	68	None	„	The secretary is a Unionist handed over from grand jury
Mayo	194,504	4,564	98	„	„	There are in this county five Unionist employés all handed over from grand jury
Grand total	1,777,802	151,568	4,491	—	—	—

It will be seen from the total figures in this return that in these nineteen counties and ridings in Ireland, with a population of 1,777,802

Roman Catholics and 151,568 Protestants, the county councils have only appointed five Unionists to any position of emolument in their gift since the passing of the Act in 1898.

These five Unionists were as follows:

In Clare, a deputy road surveyor.

In King's, a Scotch *specialist* on agricultural instruction.

In South Tipperary, a medical superintendent of the asylum.

Let me finish this section with a quotation from an article by 'Pat,' a professing Catholic, who is also the author of *Economics for Irishmen*, a most remarkable book which should be in the hands of every student of the Irish problem:

> The board of guardians and district council, in their capacity as the local branch of the United Irish League, hold a secret meeting in a public-house, with the priest in the chair, and, under his direction, decide what they are to do at the public meeting in the board room afterwards, even to the appointment of a sub-sanitary officer—*that is local government in Ireland.*

III

In addition to the exercise of their patronage on the principle that superior professional or other qualifications on the part of a candidate are to be deliberately set on one side, for the sole reason that he belongs to the creed and political faith of the minority, the Nationalist local bodies have another method of obeying Mr. Redmond's command 'to carry on the National work in their council chambers'—I allude to their surreptitious attempts to finance the League out of the rates by only giving contracts to, or by preferring members of the League to others. So bad, indeed, had this system become that the late Government were compelled to pass a statute in 1902 (2 Edw. VII. c. 38, sec. 18) to oblige local bodies to record the reason why tenders were accepted or rejected, so that the auditors might see where an undue preference was given. A typical example is the well-known case of the Mullingar Guardians, the facts of which are as follows:

At a meeting of the Guardians of the Mullingar Poor-law Union, held on the 8th of September, 1902, a resolution was passed 'that no person but a Nationalist should be accepted as contractor to the Union of Mullingar.'

At a meeting of the Guardians held on the 25th of September, 1902, tenders were received for the supply of oatmeal. A Mr. Ross tendered 11*l.* 9*s.* and a Mr. Daly 14*l.* per ton. The latter was accepted.

The Local Government Board wrote for an explanation, and received a reply dated the 9th of October, 1902: 'The Guardians beg to inform your Board the reason they had for accepting the highest tender for oatmeal was that Daly was and is a member of the United Irish League, and the others were not.'

Proceedings were immediately instituted by the Government to declare the contract void, and the Court of Chancery, on the consent of the Guardians, made the necessary order for the purpose.

Again and again have local authorities made similar attempts to misuse their powers, and but for the audit of the Local Government Board there can be no doubt that the practice of penalising Unionists by undue preference given to members of the League would become almost universal. The great safeguard, however, which exists at present against maladministration—the foundation of the whole success of the Local Government Act—is *the audit*. The local authorities know that the auditor will surcharge illegal payments, and that if it is a case of wilful maladministration or reckless extravagance the Local Government Board as the appellate tribunal will uphold the auditor.

Under Mr. Birrell's Bill all this is altered. Make the decision of the Local Government Board subject to the approval of an elected body and you will see every Roman Catholic institution subsidised from the rates. There will be favouritism and reckless extravagance. No persons but United Leaguers will get contracts, and the highest will be accepted with impunity. The Mullingar case will be repeated openly. There will thus be a premium for joining the Nationalist organisations; and the 650,000*l.* contributed by the British taxpayer to buy off Mr. Redmond's opposition will disappear like Oliver Twist's helping of porridge—and with like demands to follow.

Under the existing system of government in Ireland an auditor's decision in a case like that of the Mullingar Guardians is upheld, but under Mr. Birrell's 'reform' any auditor who objected to a United Leaguer receiving undue preference would be simply transferred by the Nationalist council to another district—or dismissed!

Enough has been said to indicate broadly the spirit in which the Local Government Act of 1898 has been worked by the Nationalist organisations. The quotations and statistics given are in no way complete. They are merely typical examples which can be multiplied *ad infinitum*, and those who care to study further Irish local political life can find ample material in Mr. Ivan Müller's recently published book, *Ireland To-day and To-morrow*. Admitting, therefore—and the fact is not contradicted by the Nationalist leaders themselves—that the powers given to the local bodies have been used wherever the Nationalist influence predominates for the purpose of improving the Home Rule machinery, can any reasonable man doubt that the control over the administration of the country, over the finances, and over the public servants of the Government departments, will be used for any other object? These powers are very real. I have already referred to the question of the audit. What will be the position in regard to the administration of the law connected with local government!

Then, again, the matter of education. The religious question enters into every detail of Irish life. An attempt has been made to discount the value of the electoral statistics of the county councils

on the grounds that in certain Protestant counties of Ulster there are a very large majority of Protestants elected to serve on the local bodies. That these Protestant majorities exist in some seven of the Irish counties is perfectly true, but it in no way affects my argument.

If both parties want to fight instead of one, does that fact add to your reasons for removing the referee who sees that they fight fair? It is probable that under an Ulster majority on the central council Roman Catholic institutes would suffer. It is equally probable that under a Roman Catholic majority (which is of course a certainty) the Protestant institutions will go to the wall. Personally, I object to either result.

Finally, what will be the position of the Civil servants in the transferred departments?

On the 7th of May the Liberal party voted for the Devolution Bill in order to 'improve' the system of government in Ireland. Ten days previously an example of this 'improvement' was forthcoming in a demand from the Nationalist party, of so determined a nature that the Government were compelled to yield, for the removal, *solely on the grounds that he was a Unionist*, of a man whose best energies and money were being given whole-heartedly to the work of Irish development.

The question of Sir Horace Plunkett's efficiency did not arise. His dismissal from the sphere of activity in which he was engaged, and the termination of his efforts on behalf of Ireland, were brought about simply because, in the words of Mr. Dillon, 'he is a Unionist and an enemy of the Nationalist party.'

What an object-lesson for England on the eve of a measure for the government of Ireland according to Home Rule ideas! What a dilemma for those Liberals who profess to believe that Nationalist administration will not mean the social and political outlawry of the minority!

Can any reasonable man doubt that, as Mr. Dillon in the past has urged the local government electorate 'to give their vote to no candidate who is not a member of the United Irish League,' as he now objects to the retention in an administrative office of a man *because* he is not in favour of Home Rule—so also will he and his colleagues, in the future, make use of any fresh powers which may be given to them simply as weapons to strengthen their own position? There can be but one answer. I ask, therefore, with Ireland deliberately administered in this spirit, the sole object of which is to further the interests of a particular political party, irrespective of the development and welfare of the country, what chance can there be of such firm and wise government as can alone make for prosperity and peace?

GERALD ARBUTHNOT.

THE IRISH COUNCIL BILL

THE disapproval with which the Irish Council Bill has been greeted in Ireland seems to be due partly to misunderstanding, but principally to the fact that the Irish people have based their hopes upon the confident assertions of official Unionism that the Bill would involve Home Rule or something indistinguishable from it, and have ignored the emphatic assurances of official Liberalism that it would have nothing whatever to do with Home Rule. On second thoughts Irishmen must, I think, admit that the Government at any rate have not broken faith, and they may perceive that the Bill has certain merits not to be despised. It must be conceded that in introducing the measure His Majesty's Government have carried out their pledges during the last General Election with a photographic fidelity most exemplary, somewhat unusual in parliamentary annals, and decidedly perplexing to their opponents.

During the election campaign many prominent members of the present Cabinet repeatedly assured the electors that no measure resembling in its scope Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills would be submitted to Parliament. Even those who have never concealed their belief that an independent Parliament with an executive responsible to it affords the only solution of the Irish problem, stated definitely that those views would not be embodied in any Bill. The present Prime Minister specifically pledged himself in that sense, but at the same time avowed his intention, if he had the opportunity, of submitting to Parliament a Bill for extending local self-government in Ireland, and urged the Nationalists not to hastily spurn such a measure if it was not inconsistent with their larger policy. Sir Edward Grey dotted the 'i's' and crossed the 't's' of the Prime Minister's statement at Stirling when he defined the Liberal party's immediate duty to be 'to take up the sympathetic policy of the administration of Irish affairs with the help of Sir Antony MacDonnell, where the Conservative party had left it for want of courage to go on with it.' Mr. Haldane, after referring to the fact that the late Government had practically abandoned a policy of coercion, expressed his opinion that 'under any system of government the Irish people

can only be ruled if attention be paid to their own wishes, and those wishes be allowed to prevail in matters which do not touch the integrity of the Empire. Such a policy involves,' he said, 'progressive development in the policy of devolution commenced by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Wyndham.' Such were the views and undertakings laid before the people, and it cannot be denied that the Irish Council Bill was framed in strict accordance with them. In introducing the Bill, Mr. Birrell said: 'It does not contain a touch or a trace, a hint or a suggestion of any new legislative power or authority.' Mr. Arthur Balfour made a similar admission. He recognised that 'the new assembly is not a legislative body;' and, after wondering whether the Nationalists would accept the proposal, he added: 'I know it has not the slightest resemblance to any plan that they ever favoured, and I am unable to see how by any legitimate process it is capable of development into anything they have suggested.' Mr. Redmond, in referring to the Government measure, said: 'What they offer to-day is not Home Rule, it is not offered to us as Home Rule, it is not offered as a substitute or an alternative for Home Rule.' We have, therefore, a combined declaration on the part of the spokesman for the Government—the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—of the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, and of the leader of the Irish Nationalist party in Parliament, that the Irish Council Bill is not Home Rule, bears no resemblance to Home Rule, and cannot possibly be developed into Home Rule. How, then, should the Bill be described? It is a scheme of departmental co-ordination combined with the delegation to a body mainly elected by the people of Ireland of control over the more important branches of Irish government, and over more than one-half of the expenditure on the public service in Ireland. It lies, in fact, in the line of natural, orderly progression of the policy pursued under the Viceroyalties of Lord Zetland, Lord Cadogan, and Lord Dudley by Mr. Arthur Balfour, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and Mr. George Wyndham. It might be fairly described in Mr. Wyndham's words, as designed to promote 'the co-ordination of detached and semi-detached boards and departments,' and to provide for 'the consolidation and increase of existing grants for Irish local purposes.'

The scheme is very modest. It does not pretend to satisfy in any degree the aspirations of Nationalists. It falls far short of the suggestions of the Irish Reform Association. It is less ambitious than were proposals made by Unionist leaders years ago. In alluding to the Irish question in a manifesto to his supporters, issued on the 11th of June, 1886, Mr. Chamberlain said the objects to be kept in view are:

> to relieve the Imperial Parliament by devolution of Irish local business, to secure the free representation of Irish opinion in all matters of purely Irish concern, to offer to Irishmen a fair field for legitimate local ambition and patriotism, and by removing all unnecessary interference with Irish government

on the part of Great Britain, to diminish the causes of irritation and the opportunity of collision.

And the Duke of Devonshire also expressed himself in favour of devolution, provided that 'the powers which may be conferred on local bodies should be delegated—not surrendered—by Parliament;' that 'the subjects to be delegated should be clearly defined, and the right of Parliament to control and revise the action of legislative or administrative authorities should be quite clearly reserved.' But, though causing disappointment in many quarters and in many ways, the Government have, I think, shown wisdom in confining their measure to administrative reform. Had their proposals involved, as was desired by the Irish Reform Association, the delegation of legislative functions, it might have been difficult for them to clear themselves of the accusation of breaking pledges to the electorate. As it is, no one can honestly pretend that the Bill is an advance in the direction of Home Rule, for no legislative functions whatever are delegated to the Council proposed to be set up. The Bill is a thing apart, and ought to be considered on its merits without reference to or comparison with any demands for autonomy that have been made, and without prejudice to any schemes of devolution which have been advanced or which the future may bring forth.

Criticism may therefore be confined to (1) an examination of the constitution of the Council, (2) its method of procedure, and (3) its powers and the limitations imposed upon those powers.

(1) It is proposed that the Council should consist of eighty-two members elected by the Local Government electors, twenty-four nominated members, and one *ex-officio* member, making a total of 107. The Parliamentary divisions constitute the electoral areas for which sixty-five out of the eighty-two elected members are to be returned; while in the case of the seventeen remaining elected members two or more Parliamentary divisions are rolled into one. There is no University representation. The Parliamentary representation of 103 is thus reduced to eighty-two.

For a purely administrative body such a Council is, in my opinion, too large, and would be found unwieldy in the management of its affairs. According to Mr. Birrell, an able and benevolent despotism is the ideal form of government for Ireland. That is, of course, a figure of speech, but the idea outlined in it is sound. It may be safely laid down that, provided the hands are sufficient to tackle the work, the efficiency of any administrative body is in inverse proportion to the numbers composing that body. A Council of, say, forty-eight members elected by county and borough councils with a nominated element of, say, twelve members, would form a far more serviceable body in view of the nature of the functions to be discharged.

by it. And county and borough councils would be preferable as an electorate for other reasons. The important fact, recognised by the leader of the Nationalists in Parliament, but apparently ignored by the National Convention, that the Bill does not attempt to set up a body in any way of the nature of a Parliament should be emphasised. It is highly desirable that purely political considerations should, so far as is possible in Ireland, be tacitly omitted in the formation of a financial Council. The institution of Parliamentary areas might be regarded by the electors as an instruction to make political considerations supreme; whereas county councils, having acquired large and valuable experience in the administration of financial and other affairs, would realise the necessity of sending men of great business capacity to manage the affairs of the nation. It is true that, even with such constituencies, political considerations would certainly not be excluded; but there would be some chance that the business idea would take precedence of, or would at any rate modify, the political idea, to the obvious advantage of the Council as a purely administrative body. With the Parliamentary constituencies, as proposed in the Bill, it is probable that the political idea would preponderate over, if not entirely swamp, the business idea.

The nominated section of the Council is, I presume, designed to secure the representation of minorities, and to enlist the services of valuable men who are not partisans of any political organisation. I dislike the idea of nomination, but in this case it may be necessary, for the following reasons. In the first place, proposals for electoral minority representation would require a complete recasting of the whole electorate system, would lead to endless discussion, and would so complicate the measure as to be impracticable. In the second place, minorities, whether estimated on a religious, political, industrial, or social basis, are so small over the greater part of Ireland that no system of minority representation would secure them anything like adequate representation on the Council. Such minorities should be represented, and nomination is therefore necessary; but I should like to see it gradually succeeded by a system of co-option. It may be taken for granted that political and class considerations would, at any rate at first, largely influence, if not entirely dominate, elections by the people to the Council. But it would not sway election by the Council of co-opted members to anything like the same extent. A Council would be intensely anxious to justify itself, and to show its capacity to deal with the affairs of the nation. It would come to see that, for that purpose, the nation as a whole should be represented on it, and cannot be so represented through election by an electorate almost entirely composed of classes engaged in one industry —agriculture. I am confident that the Council, once established and in good working order, could be perfectly trusted to co-opt men who

would make it in a fair measure representative of all industries and classes in the country.

(2) The business of the Council might be conducted by one of two methods—either by committees as provided in the Bill, or by the appointment of members of the Council as heads of the departments transferred to it. The first method may be described as being framed on the municipal, and the second on the Parliamentary model. The latter has much to recommend it on the score of directness and simplicity, and for other reasons. The Crown, directly or through the Lord Lieutenant, would appoint, after consultation with the Council, a member to represent each department placed under the control of the Council. If there were eight departments there would be eight ministers, forming a sort of Cabinet, holding office at the pleasure of the Council; but there is no precedent for such an arrangement in a purely administrative body, and its introduction at the outset in an untried and inexperienced body might be a somewhat doubtful experiment. A very close analogy to Parliament would be created, and the tendency might be to subordinate efficient administration to political or possibly even to sectarian considerations; party struggles might prove detrimental to the efficient management of the affairs of the nation. That the business of the United Kingdom and of the Empire is carried on with comparative smoothness under our system of party government is due to the fact that, subject to very large and general changes of policy, it is conducted by the permanent Civil servants at the head of the great departments of State without break of continuity. If the Parliamentary model were adopted on the Council, administration might gradually fall into the hands of the permanent Civil servants, thereby depriving the people of effective control through their representatives. Administration by councils acting through committees has proved by experience to work well. On the whole, though the Parliamentary model is attractive, His Majesty's Government have, I believe, been wise in adopting the municipal model in their Bill—a course which does not preclude the possibility that experience would show advantages in the other system. Unquestionably, however, the Council should select its own committees, and the committees should select their own chairmen at any rate after the expiration of the first three years.

(3) The Bill transfers to the Irish Council eight of the principal departments dealing with Irish affairs, including the Local Government Board, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, the Congested Districts Board, and the Commissioners of Public Works. The duties of the Lord Lieutenant to frame regulations for the Estates Commissioners in carrying out the provisions of the Land Act of 1903 are transferred to the Council. Primary and intermediate education are also transferred. A good deal of misunderstanding appears to exist on the subject of the creation of a department

of education. It seems to be forgotten that to all intents and purposes such a department already exists. The proposal is to bring it under the supervision of the Council. For this purpose an Education Committee is to be created to which educational experts not being members of the Council will be appointed. In a matter of such importance it is probable that two committees would be created with six nominated experts on each; but even if there were only one committee with six nominated experts upon it the Council could not be deprived of the advice and assistance of those best qualified to deal with the educational needs of the youth of the country. The exact proportion of nominated to elected members is a matter of detail. The Committee or Committees should be formed after consultation with the Council. The Bill also authorises the Lord Lieutenant, after consultation with the Council, to transfer powers over other and minor departments; and it proposes to enact that the King in Council may 'declare any powers of any Government department or authority in England, so far as they are exercised in or in relation to Ireland, to be powers to which the Act applies.' The prospective functions of the Council are not therefore confined to the exercise of the powers immediately conferred upon it.

The powers devolving on the Council within the limits of business assigned to it are complete. Questions are decided by the majority of those voting. Patronage is in the hands of the Council. On this point also considerable misapprehension appears to exist. The drafting of the Bill is slovenly, but the intention is, I think, clear enough. The Council is to be formed for the purpose of preliminary work in 1908, but it is not to undertake executive business until 1909. Clauses 2 and 22 are evidently designed to transfer patronage to the Council when it becomes operative in 1909, and to provide for appointments up to that time. In finance, the estimates are to be submitted to the Council, and the Council makes such appropriations as it thinks fit. It can make supplemental appropriation and, on the other hand, it can carry over or transfer unexpended balances. On these large powers certain checks designed mainly for the safeguarding of minorities may, if necessary, be exercised. Personally I do not for a moment believe that the majority of the Council would desire to deal unfairly or harshly by the minority. But the fears of the minority, though in my opinion not well founded, are nevertheless genuine and should be allayed. They can be allayed only by practical experience, and protection is in the meantime necessary. We have the declaration of Mr. Redmond, repeated over and over again in his most admirable speech on the introduction of the Bill, that, speaking for the Nationalist party, he would agree to 'any desirable safeguards' and was anxious to show 'that the desire of the majority of the Irish people is not to do wrong to anybody.' It is obvious that the only guarantee that is worth more than verbal assurance is to be found

in some appeal to the ultimate judgment of Parliament. The Bill accordingly gives certain powers to the Lord Lieutenant, as the channel of communication with the Ministry of the day and Parliament. He can refer back any resolution to the Council for further consideration and communicate his reasons for doing so; and he can veto the resolutions of the Council. These powers are practically the same as those inherent in the Crown and exercised by the representative of the Crown in all self-governing Colonies. In the case of a legislative body they would afford sufficient protection, legislation being positive in its character. But in a purely administrative body the veto and the power of referring back is not sufficient, for a minority could be ill-treated negatively as well as positively; refusal to act might be as injurious as action. The reservation of power to the Lord Lieutenant is not well expressed. Better drafting would, I think, remove most of the objections urged against it, but the idea is sound if the unfounded fears of the minority are to be allayed. It is difficult to see how really effective safeguards can be introduced otherwise than by giving some power of action in the case of extreme necessity to someone. After all, in considering matters of this kind an assumption of *bona fides* must be made. It would, of course, be easy to show that the Lord Lieutenant and a Government and majority in Parliament actively hostile to the Council and determined upon creating a breakdown could exercise the powers of the Bill in such a manner as to bring about that result. It is equally easy to prove that the Nationalist majority on the Council, if they desire to wreck the machine, would find no difficulty in doing so. We are bound to assume that the powers inherent in the majority and the powers confided to the Lord Lieutenant would on the whole be exercised in a fair and reasonable spirit.

This criticism of the constitution, procedure and powers of the Council, though short, is I think sufficient to show that the objections to the Bill urged before the Convention and in the public press in Ireland are concerned with details; that they raise points which ought to be threshed out in Parliament, and are not of a character to justify the rejection of the measure. I will now proceed to discuss the all-important question of finance.

To form a correct conclusion, examination cannot be confined to the adequacy of the provision made for the normal expenditure of the departments handed over to the Council. Other matters connected with the political and economic condition of Ireland must be also considered. If that examination be conducted in a fair, generous and impartial spirit it will, I think, be found that the financial proposals in the Bill are in many respects inadequate.

Ireland in her long insistence on her right to complete autonomy has, outside of theory, justified her contention by insisting that she is capable of managing her own affairs, not only as well but better than

anybody else can manage them for her; and that in doing so she would be just to all men. She was put upon her trial, to a certain extent, when County Government was granted in 1898, and she has come well out of that trial. Whether in respect of probity or efficiency in administration; the borough and county councils in Ireland compare favourably with similar institutions in Great Britain. By Mr. Birrell's Bill she would be subjected to a severer test, and it is but natural that men representing the vast majority of the Irish people should be reluctant to accept a responsibility upon the due discharge of which their political claims must to a great extent stand or fall, unless they feel assured that the operations of the Council would not be impeded by scarcity of funds. They have a right to insist upon a fair chance and a little more. It must be remembered also that the expenses of the Council will be considerable, necessitating the employment of a large staff. Democratic administration is always expensive. County councils in Great Britain and Ireland cost more than the old system of quarter sessions or grand juries; and quarter sessions and grand juries cost more than if administration had been concentrated in one hand. If the ideal despot mentioned by Mr. Birrell could be found, unquestionably the administrative affairs of Ireland would be conducted at considerable less charge than must be involved in administration by a Council of 107 members; full allowance should therefore be made for increased cost of administration. Furthermore, Ireland must not be looked upon as a going concern. The estate is not in a good state of repair; on the contrary, it has been grossly neglected and is in a very bad state of repair. A large capital outlay is in many respects necessary.

The main conception of the Bill evidently is that the administration of certain departments of the public service in Ireland should be handed over to the Council on consideration of grants of moneys sufficient to enable the Council to carry on the administration of the transferred departments. The money voted by Parliament for the sustenance of the transferred departments for the present year appears to be taken as the basis of the arrangement, with the addition of a small sum to satisfy the prospective needs of each department, and the general industrial requirements of the country.

It is proposed to create an Irish Fund, divided into three compartments:

(1) General Provision grant;
(2) Public Works grant; and
(3) Supplemental grant.

The Chief Secretary has promised to present to Parliament a return of the income of each of the transferred departments or services, and till that return is available it is impossible to judge accurately whether the General Provision, fixed by clause 5 (3) of the Bill at three and three-quarter millions, is adequate or not; but

from the terms of the Bill and the Parliamentary statement of votes a general idea can be formed as to the sufficiency of the provision. From section 7 of the Bill it appears that the 'General Provision' will include the Local Taxation Account, which varies little for Ireland from year to year, and was last year 1,446,000*l.* From last year's votes it can be gathered that the transferred departments received maintenance sums aggregating about two and a quarter millions, excluding the endowments which some enjoy and which are not shown on the votes. Some of the expenditure was, however, for Imperial purposes, and subject to correction on further information. I should say that, for purely Irish purposes, the expenditure on the transferred departments was about 2,100,000*l.* If this sum is added to the Local Taxation Account mentioned above, and the total deducted from the 'General Provision' of 3,750,000*l.*, the remainder will be 204,000*l.*, which, if this calculation be correct, is the sum allowed for the development and improvement of the transferred departments during the first five years of the arrangement. In my opinion this sum is inadequate, and should be raised by at least an additional 100,000*l.* a year. It is beyond dispute that many Irish services, particularly education, have been starved, and that the country is languishing from a parsimonious policy very different from that pursued in Great Britain, and that the time has come for a wiser and more liberal policy to be inaugurated.

The Bill also provides two additional grants—namely, the Public Works grant of 300,000*l.* and the Supplemental grant of 114,000*l.*, which, taken with the 204,000*l.* referred to above as the allowance for departmental improvement and development, make up 618,000*l.*, a sum which falls short by 32,000*l.* of the 650,000*l.* stated by Mr. Birrell in his speech on the introduction of the Bill to be the amount of the new and additional yearly grant. If my calculations are correct, no doubt this deficiency would be made good.

The Public Works grant consists, as mentioned above, of an annual sum of 300,000*l.* provided in clause 5 (3), which is carried to a particular account called the Public Works Account, the object being, as Mr. Birrell said, 'of providing the new Council with a sum upon which, if they like, they can borrow and obtain advances, being certain of the sum they will receive each year during the five years.' Mr. Birrell does not mention the terms upon which the Council is likely to be able to borrow money for five years. I consider that this Public Works grant is insignificantly small, and that the borrowing powers of the Council under the Bill as it stands are illusory. Under the Bill the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland appear to have power to raise money on the security of the whole Irish Fund, but the Irish Fund is liable to unknown charges for losses on flotation of stock for the purpose of carrying on the Land Purchase Act, and it is a fluctuating amount, being fixed for a period of five years only.

Investors would naturally be shy in making advances on the security of an uncertain income. It would probably be wiser, therefore, to set aside a certain annual sum for the service of loans.

Clause 5 (3) of the Bill also provides the Supplemental grant of 114,000*l.*, "which is also," according to Mr. Birrell, 'intended for expenditure in the nature of capital expenditure' on the departments and to satisfy new charges, such as, I presume, the cost of the Council, the Irish Treasury, and so forth. The cost of the Irish Council and Treasury with the necessary establishments cannot fall far short of 50,000*l.* per annum, and there would then be left a mere 64,000*l.* per annum to remedy the crying scandal of the insanitary hovels misnamed National schoolhouses, and to undertake other improvements urgently required. Manifestly this grant is wholly inadequate.

These three grants make up a total of 4,164,000*l.*, and, in addition to this sum, certain annual payments aggregating, I believe, 140,000*l.* or thereabouts, derived from the Irish Church surplus, are made to the Congested Districts Board, the Board of Agriculture, and the Intermediate Education Board. These payments bring up the total amount forming the Irish Fund to about 4,300,000*l.*

Two other ways of assisting Ireland are indicated but are not defined in the Bill. The country is somehow or other to be relieved from losses incidental to the floating of Land Purchase Loans at a discount; and economies effected in the cost of existing establishments not transferred are presumably to go to her credit.

The first method is concerned with the Ireland Development grant. The Development grant is a sum of 185,000*l.* given under the Act of 1902 as an equivalent to the grants given to England and Scotland for educational purposes. Ireland made a bad bargain in agreeing that the amount should be stereotyped at 185,000*l.* The educational grant for England and Scotland has largely increased since 1902, and the Irish grant, being in the nature of an equivalent, ought to have been proportionately increased. There are certain charges on the Development grant—namely, 20,000*l.* to the Congested Districts Board; permanent educational charges amounting, according to last year's estimates, to 74,118*l.*; and a charge of 70,000*l.* running for sixty-eight and a half years to satisfy the loss already made on the flotation of loans under the Land Act of 1903. These charges reduce the grant to 20,000*l.* a year. The Bill in its fourteenth clause proposes that the grant to the Congested Districts Board amounting to 20,000*l.*, and, I infer, the 74,118*l.* for educational purposes are to be taken off the Development grant and charged to the General Provision grant; and that the Development grant, reduced to 165,000*l.*, should then be chargeable for losses on flotation. With all this chopping and changing, transference of charges from one fund to another, and earmarking certain annual sums as for capital expenditure, it is not easy to estimate

what the financial condition of the Council will be; but, speaking broadly, it may, I think, be said that the amount allotted to the service of the transferred departments—namely, the amount voted for the current year—is, with the sum of 204,000*l.* which I make out to be the additional grant given under the head of 'General Provision,' barely sufficient to carry on with and to make a little progress; but without going into details, it is surely obvious that the sums of 204,000*l.* and 114,000*l.* are quite insufficient to develop the Agricultural department with its Technical Education branch, and to put primary and intermediate education on a proper basis by converting pig-sties into tolerably sanitary schoolrooms, providing decent salaries for the teaching staff, and generally satisfying the educational needs of the community.

Though it is reasonable that losses accruing under the operations of the Land Act of 1903 through default in the punctual payment of annuities should be borne by the local authorities, it is outrageous that losses on flotation should fall upon them, or upon the Development grant, or the general income of Ireland. The loans are raised on the whole of the security of the whole United Kingdom. It is true the expenditure is for the direct benefit of one portion of the United Kingdom—Ireland; but Ireland is not raising money in the capacity of a self-governing colony pledging her own resources with an Imperial guarantee. She is not responsible for a decline in British credit, nor for faulty financial methods which have resulted in the extraordinary fact that a 2¾ per cent. stock has no preference over a stock bearing interest at only 2½, the security being in both cases the same. It is not just to charge discount on flotation against Ireland's account; and, moreover, she cannot bear the loss. It would eat up the Development grant in a very short time, would make bankrupts of the county councils, and would cause a serious inroad on the general fund.

The intention of the Bill in respect to crediting the Irish account with savings made in departments not placed under her control is obscure. It is stated in clause 5 (3) of the Bill that 'in fixing the general provision for any future periods, regard shall be had to any benefit to the Exchequer arising during the preceding period from any savings or reduction on the total expenditure on Irish services in relation to powers other than powers to which the Act applies.' Various constructions may be placed upon this paragraph, but it may be assumed, as I think correctly, that Ireland is intended to get the benefit of such savings. She is certainly entitled to it, and the savings should be placed to her credit as they accrue. The department in which large economies may be possible, if warranted by circumstances, is the police. The amount would depend upon the condition of the country; and it is but fair that the people should get full credit for economies dependent upon the conduct of the people.

Speaking broadly, and on the assumption that grants for higher education, or recommended by Royal Commissions, would be Imperial charges, the financial provisions would, with the exceptions mentioned, be sufficient if Ireland could be looked upon as a property well drained and fenced, furnished with suitable roads and dwellings, and in a thoroughly well-organised and efficient condition. But we all know that such is not the case, and that large sums are required to put it in good repair and to place it on a profit-making basis. It is impossible for the Council to deal with such great questions as arterial drainage, afforestation, improvement of harbours, and means of communication on the basis of funds provided in the Bill, and it would be wise to enable it to do so. The credit of Great Britain is largely pledged in Ireland, and expenditure on public works is in her interest as an insurance against loss on land purchase and other loans. It is quite possible that the Council could borrow money for such a specific purpose as arterial drainage on easier terms than the Treasury appears able to borrow for the Land Act of 1903. There are many wealthy Irishmen in the United States and in the Colonies; if their sympathy goes deeper than verbal profession and the occasional dollar it could find convenient expression in underwriting a loan. At any rate, it should be clearly understood and acknowledged that the provisions made for financing the Council are not calculated to enable it to undertake large public works, and Parliament should be pledged, so far as it can pledge itself, to pay adequate attention to resolutions of the Council dealing with them.

On this subject of finance also the objections to the Bill raise questions eminently suitable for discussion in Parliament, and do not warrant the summary rejection of the Bill. It is difficult, therefore, to understand the motives actuating the Nationalist party. The measure does not in any way affect their aspirations and demands. It does not pretend to deal with them; even without a word of repudiation on their part no one could for a moment imagine that they accept it as a discharge of any of their political claims. It would place them in possession of two arguments of great utility by enabling them to demonstrate the capacity of Irishmen to manage their own affairs, and to show that the interests and feelings of minorities are safe in the hands of the majority; and, above all, it would enable them to do something immediately for the regeneration of Ireland. It is the most that they could get now; they may be able and anxious to wait, but Ireland cannot afford to wait. 'While Ireland has been waiting'—to use Mr. Redmond's eloquent words—'there has been a gaping wound in her side, and her sons have had to stand by helpless while they saw her very life blood pouring out before their eyes.' It ought to be accepted by all Irish Unionists who are also Irishmen with the welfare of their country at heart, for it gives the Irish people the power of administering purely Irish affairs and all

the advantages to be derived therefrom. It ought to be accepted by all sensible Unionists in Great Britain, for it is merely the natural development of the policy pursued by the Unionist party down to the beginning of 1905 with much success. It is in fact a Unionist child left abandoned on the doorstep of the present Government.

The Unionist comments upon the Bill are quite illogical. It is evident that this modest extension of self-government came as a surprise to those apostles of a negative unionism whose political wisdom is cramped and cabined within the limits of successive Coercion Acts. Anticipation had been raised by intractable persons that the Bill would be a Home Rule measure designed to place the Protestant minority under the heels of a Catholic majority dominated by an intolerant hierarchy; and would involve a decided breach in the Act of Union. The result of the preliminary campaign which preceded the introduction of the Bill is amusing. On the following morning the Unionist press, having evidently prepared strings of adjectives in advance, commented on the measure in wilful blindness of its very restricted proposals; and in spite of Mr. Arthur Balfour's assurance to the contrary described it as 'Home Rule'; such an illogical campaign cannot be continued. The objections that can be raised to the real Bill are few and very flimsy. The argument that the machine would be proved unworkable in order to extort independence is absurd. The idea that Nationalists would endeavour to establish the legislative claims of Ireland by showing her administrative incapacity is ridiculous. Equally silly is the argument that you must not give people lesser powers for fear they should prove to you that you can with safety and advantage trust them with larger powers. The assertion that the scheme as it might be amended will prove unworkable is based on the assumption that the Council will desire that it should be unworkable; but, on that assumption, it is easily proved that no existing or conceivable constitution of any sort or kind, written or unwritten, could possibly work well.

The amount of opposition that the Bill would be likely to receive in Great Britain cannot be gauged, depending as it does upon unknown quantities—the gullibility of the British people and the desire of politicians to play upon it. The Bill is, as I have shown, far more modest in its scope than measures which Unionists were prepared to accord to Ireland years ago. It is, as I have also shown, in the logical sequence of the policy pursued by Unionists during the last decade. It is difficult to see how statesmen who were willing to give Ireland more when she was seething with crime can be unwilling to give Ireland less now that she is tranquil and seeking to attain her ends by legitimate and constitutional means. But even if such a strange and illogical course were to be pursued it would be necessary to persuade the electorate that a Bill conferring no legislative powers whatever, confined to the devolution of

administrative functions, merely handing over to the elected of the people control over certain departments dealing solely with Irish local affairs, is a worse thing than or the same thing as a Bill proposing to set up a sovereign independent Parliament and executive responsible to it. I doubt if the credulity of the British public would stand so severe a strain. The probability is that the Irish Council Bill, wisely amended, would find a place upon the Statute book. How such a consummation can be deemed injurious to Ireland's prospects in the present or in the future is difficult to understand.

DUNRAVEN.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY *cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.*

INDEX TO VOL. LXI

The titles of articles are printed in italics

ADM

ADMIRALTY, Recent Attacks on the, 195–208
Æsthetic ideals and the art of Giotto, 76–86
Afghanistan and its Ruler, 42–51
Agricultural depression and burdens on land, 419–428
Agricultural Education in the United Kingdom, 108–118
Ahasuerus, the Wandering Jew, The legend of, 969–979
Alcohol, its use and abuse, 833–836
Ali (Ameer), *Afghanistan and its Ruler*, 42–51; *Unrest in India, The —its Meaning*, 873–885
American laws of divorce, 119–126
'Angelic Council,' The, 752–763
Angling on Tweed and Test, 638–644
Anglo-French Alliance from a French point of view, 12–26
Arbuthnot (Gerald), *How Local Government is worked in Ireland*, 1024–1032
Archer (William), *Ibsen's Imperialism*, 244–255
Army Bill, The, and the auxiliary forces, 742–751
Army reform and compulsory military training, 364–376
Art and beauty and the blight of machinery, 68–75
Arthur (Sir George), *Imperial Outposts*, 736–741
Austria and the Bosnians, 685–700
Authors and Publishers, 852–859

BAGHDAD, The Dogs of: a Study from Life, 1004–1011
Bank of England, Gold reserve at the, 150–162
Barker (J. Ellis), *Germany at the Parting of the Ways*, 209–226; *Will the British Empire Stand or Fall?* 715, 726
Barrie (M. Maltman), *A Democrat's Defence of the House of Lords*, 336–348

BRI

Barry (Sir John Wolfe), *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project*, 190–194
Bathurst (Katharine), *The Educational Ladder*, 776–779
Battleships and cruisers, British and foreign, 377–394
Baughan (E. A.), *The Background of Drama*, 256–264
Beasts, Our Brothers the, 808–820
Bees and Blue Flowers, 97–107
Behdjet Wahby Bey, *Pan-Islamism*, 860–872
Bengal and the Punjab, Anti-English agitation in, 873–885
Bennett (E. N.), *'A Temperance Town,'* 87–96; *Playing at Soldiers*, 742–751
Benson (Frank R.), *An Attempt to Revive the Dramatic Habit*, 237–243
Birth-Rate, The, and the Mother, 429–435
Blind (Karl), *The New Situation in Germany*, 458–471
Boer ideals and the future of South Africa, 727–735
Book-production and the demand for cheapness, 852–859
Books for tired minds, 837–842
Bosnia and the Hercegovina, A Ride through, 685–700
Bourchier's (Mr.) *Macbeth* at the Garrick Theatre, 449–457
Bradley (Rose M.), *Some London Children at Play*, 571–586
Britain's Task in Egypt, 990–995
British Army, Mr. Haldane's reductions in the, 542–548
British credit and the low price of Consols, 821–832
British Empire, The, Will it Stand or Fall? 715–726
British Fleet, The, and the Balance of Sea Power, 377–394
British military stations from Gibraltar to Japan, 736–741
British rule and native art and culture in India, 892–901

BUL

Bulman (G. W.), *Bees and Blue Flowers*, 97-107
Burghclere (Lord), *The Marriage of Peleus and Thetis*, 302-305

CAMPBELL (Lady Archibald), *Our Brothers the Beasts*, 808-820
Cardigan (Earl of), *The Church of England: a Plea for Reform*, 509-516
Catullus, Carmen lxiv. translated, 302-305
Catullus, The Influence of, 163-172
Ceylon pearl fishery, The, 843-851
Channel Tunnel Project, The Revived, 173-194
Channel Tunnel, The, and Public Opinion, Supplement to February number
Chapman (Hon. Mrs.), *Women and Politics: a Rejoinder*, 595-601
Chenier (André) and the Reign of Terror, 136-141
Child-bearing and child-rearing, 429-435
Children, How to teach religion to, 764-775
Children's amusements in East London, 571-586
Children's Competitions, 587-592, 996-1003
Christian Missions in India, Are they a Failure? 886-891
Christine de Pisan, 602-610
Church Difficulties in France from a French Point of View, 933-949
Church (Rev. Alfred J.), *Authors and Publishers*, 852-859
Church of England, The: a Plea for Reform, 509-516
Churchill (Lord Randolph) and Tory democracy, 405-418
Civilisation and progress in Siam, 902-908
Clemenceau (M.) as Writer and Philosopher, 611-617
Clodia and Catullus, 163-172
Colchester (Lord), *The Evil of Ignoring Minorities*, 548-558
Colonial Study, A, of London Civilisation, 559-570
Colvin (Sir Auckland), *Egypt To-day*, 525-541
Commerce and the laws of maritime warfare, 918-932
Commercial unity and mutual preference within the British Empire, 701-714
Conservative Opportunists and Imperial Democracy, 405-418
Consols, The Firmness of, 821-832
Cooke (C. W. Radcliffe), *The Invasion Scare: a New View*, 395-404

ENT

Corbett (Julian S.), *Recent Attacks on the Admiralty*, 195-208; *The Capture of Private Property at Sea*, 918-932
Crome and the Norwich School of Painters, 670-684
Cromer (Lord) and 'Nationalists' in Egypt, 990-995

DAIRY-FARMS, dirt, and disease, 950-960
Daly (Dominick), '*La Jeune Captive*,' 136-141
Dance, The, and the Plastic Arts in Ancient Greece, 477-489
Davy (Lieut.-Col. F. A.), *What to Drink*, 833-836
Dimnet (Abbé Ernest), *M. Clemenceau as Writer and Philosopher*, 611-617
Divine Council of Heavenly Beings in the work of creation, 752-763
Divorce in the United States, 119-126
'*Divorce, Doctrine and Discipline of*,' *Milton's*, 127-135
Dogs of Baghdad, The: a Study from Life, 1004-1011
Down (T. C.), *Pirate Trelawny*, 798-807
Drama, The Background of, 256-264
Dramatic Habit, The, An Attempt to Revive, 237-243
Drink, What to, 833-836
Dunraven (Earl of), *Reform of the House of Lords*, 349-363; *The Irish Council Bill*, 1033-1046

EARTHQUAKE in Jamaica, The, and Sir A. Swettenham's resignation, 909-917
East-End children at play, 571-586
Education Bill, The, of 1906, and the Future of Popular Education, 1-11
Education, Elementary and Secondary, 490-500
Education, Japanese, 1012-1023
Education of children in morals and religion, 764-775
Education of Indian Princes, The, 52-55
Educational Ladder, The, 776-779
Egypt, Britain's Task in, 990-995
Egypt To-day, 525-541
Ellis (Havelock), *Religion and the Child*, 764-775
Empire, The Problem of, 701-714
Enfranchisement of women, The, and the 'sweating' system, 472-476
English manners, A Colonial view of, 559-570
English Oral Tradition, 436-445
English writers of the last century, 645-657
Entente—English or German? 12-26

EPI

Epigrams in the Greek Anthology, 629–637
Erroll (Colonel the Earl of), *Mr. Haldane's Dream of a 'National' Army*, 542–547
European education for Indian princes, 52–55
Evolution of blue flowers, 97–107
Evolution of the Income-Tax, The, 56–67
'*Ex-*,' *The Tragedy of the*, 293–301

FARMERS and landowners, 419–428
Farming and gardening, The teaching of, 108–118
Female Prisoner, The, 780–797
Female suffrage, 227–236
Fifteenth-Century Feministe, A, 602–610
Food Supply, Our, The Homes of, 950–960
Foreign troops in French and English armies, 320–335
Forest conservancy in India, 265–286
Forgotten favourites, 293–301
Foster (Sir Michael), *Education, Elementary and Secondary*, 490–500
France, The Church Difficulties in, from a French Point of View, 933–949
France, The religious crisis in, 27–41
Franco-German relations and the Anglo-French *entente*, 12–26
Franqueville (Comtesse de), *The Church Difficulties in France from a French Point of View*, 933–949
Fruit-growing and garden cities, 961–968

GERMANY at the Parting of the Ways, 209–226
Germany, France, and the *entente*, 12–26
Germany, The New Situation in, 458–471
Giotto in Modern Life, 76–86
Gore-Booth (Eva), *Women and Politics: a Reply*, 472–476; two Rejoinders to, 593–601
Government policy and the King's Speech, 517–524
Greece, Ancient, The Dance and the Plastic Arts in, 477–489
Greek Anthology, The, 629–637
Greek War of Independence, Adventures of Trelawny during the, 798–807
Grossmann (Mrs.), *A Colonial Study of London Civilisation*, 559–570

IRI

HABEEB-ULLAH KHAN, Ameer, and Afghan politics, 42–51
Haldane (Mr.) and Army reform, 364–376, 377–394
Haldane's (Mr.) Army Bill and the Auxiliary Forces, 742–751
Haldane's (Mr.) Dream of a 'National' Army, 542–547
Haliburton (Lord), *Universal Military Training is a Practicable Scheme*, 364–376
Hampshire, The Literary Associations of, 658–669
Harris (Capt. Vernon), *The Female Prisoner*, 780–797
Havell (E. B.), *Indian Administration and 'Swadeshi,'* 892–901
Hercegovina, Bosnia and the, A Ride through, 685–700
Hincks (Marcelle Azra), *The Dance and the Plastic Arts in Ancient Greece*, 477–489
History preserved in rural traditions, 436–445
Hodgson (W. Earl), *Hope for the Trout-Streams*, 638–644
Home Rule, or Irish self-government, 501–508
Home Rule and the Irish Council Bill, 1024–1032, 1033–1046
Hurd (Archibald S.), *The British Fleet and the Balance of Sea Power*, 377–394
Hyde (A. G.), *Reviewers and Reviewed: the New Culture*, 980–989

IBSEN'S Imperialism, 244–255
Idle Reading, 837–842
Imperial Democracy, Conservative Opportunists and, 405–418
Imperial Outposts, 736–741
Imperial unity for defence of the Empire, 715–726
Income-Tax, Evolution of the, 56–67
India, Christian Missions in, Are they a Failure? 886–891
India, The Forests of, and their Administration, 265–286
India, The Unrest in—its Meaning, 873–885
Indian Administration and 'Swadeshi,' 892–901
Indian Princes, The Education of, 52–55
International law as regards commerce during time of war, 918–932
Invasion Scare, The: a New View, 395–404
Ireland, How Local Government is worked in, 1024–1032
Irish Council Bill, The, 1033–1046
Irish Policy of the Government, 501–508

JAM

JAMAICA, The 'White Flag' in, 909-917
Japanese Education, 1012-1023
'*Jeune Captive, La,*' 136-141
Jones (L. A. Atherley), *The Irish Policy of the Government,* 501-508
Julian the Apostate and Ibsen's *Emperor and Galilean,* 244-255

KAPURTHALA (Raja-i-Rajgan of), *The Education of Indian Princes,* 52-55
Kemp-Welch (Mrs. W.), *A Fifteenth-Century Feministe,* 602-610
Kikuchi (Baron), *Japanese Education,* 1012-1023
King's Speech, The, 517-524
Knowles (Sir James), *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project,* 173-175
König (Prof. Eduard), *The Wandering Jew,* 969-979

LAND, What shall we do with our? 419-428
Lane (Mrs. John), *The Tragedy of the 'Ex-,'* 293-301
Lee (Sidney), his *Shakespeare and the Modern Stage* criticised, 256-264
Liberal crusade against the House of Lords, 336-348
Literary Associations of Hampshire, The, 658-669
Literary criticism in the daily Press, 980-989
Literature of the under-educated and of the over-educated, 645-657
Local Government, How it is worked in Ireland, 1024-1032
London Children at Play, Some, 571-586
London Civilisation, A Colonial Study of, 559-570
Lords, Reform of the House of, 349-363
Lords, The House of, A Democrat's Defence of, 336-348
Lucretius, Catullus, Byron and Burns, 163-172

MACBETH on the Stage, 446-456
McCrae (George), *The Evolution of the Income-Tax,* 56-67
Macdonell (Sir John), *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project,* 186-189
Macfadyen (Mrs. Alfred N.), *The Birth-Rate and the Mother,* 429-435
Machinery, The Curse of, 68-75
Madras (Bishop of), *Are Christian Missions in India a Failure?* 886-891
Maine liquor laws and Pennell's licensing system, 87-96
Maitland (Frederic William), his *Life of Leslie Stephen,* 618-628
Malcolm (Ian), *The 'White Flag' in Jamaica,* 909-917
'*Manners, The Decay of,*' 287-292
Manual training as the basis of elementary education, 776-779
Marriage and motherhood the proper sphere for women, 593-594
Martin (Eva M.), *Children's Competitions,* 587-592, 996-1003
Maurice (Major-General Sir Frederick), *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project,* 176-181
Medd (John C.), *Agricultural Education in the United Kingdom,* 108-118
Mercenaries, The Employment of, in Ancient and Modern Times, 321-335
Middle-class children's literary competitions, 587-592, 996-1003
Miéville (Sir Walter), *Britain's Task in Egypt,* 990-995
Military training for civilians, an experiment, 142-149
Military Training, Universal, as a Practicable Scheme, 364-376
Milton's 'Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce,' 127-135
Minorities, The Evil of Ignoring, 548-558
Missions in India, Christian converts among the lower castes and pariahs, 886-891
Money Market, 'Window Dressing' in the, 150-162
Monk-Bretton (Lord), *South African Loyalty,* 727-735
Montenegro, 306-320
Moral training of children, its methods and results, 764-775
Morgan (Frank Alton), *Orchard Cities,* 961-968
Muhammadan unrest in Egypt, 525-541
Murray (Col. A. M.), his *Imperial Outposts* reviewed, 736-741
'Mussulman Peril,' The alleged, 860-872

NAQUET (ALFRED), *Entente—English or German?* 12-26
Navy, The British, and its critics, 195-208
Nest (G. Willett Van), *Divorce in the United States,* 119-126
Nicholas (Prince) and the Montenegrins, 306-319

NIC

NIC

Nicholson (Arthur P.), *The Norwich School and their Last Exponent*, 670–684
Nisbet (John), *The Forests of India and their Administration*, 265–286
Norwich School, The, and their Last Exponent, 670–684

ORCHARD Cities, 961–968
Oysters and pearl divers, 843–851

PAGAN mysticism in M. Clemenceau's writings, 611–617
Pageants, plays, and folk-songs, 237–243
Palmer (Rev. Dr. A. Smythe), '*The Angelic Council*,' 752–763
Pan-Islamism, 860–872
Pariah dogs of Baghdad, The, 1004–1011
Parliament and politics, 1–11, 336–348, 349–363, 405–418, 501–508, 517–524, 1033–1046
Parliamentary redistribution and representation of minorities, 548–558
Patriotism and the defence of the Empire, 395–404
Patriotism and 'Swadeshi' in India, 892–901
Paul (Herbert), *The Influence of Catullus*, 163–172; *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project*, 182–183; *The King's Speech*, 517–524; *The Greek Anthology*, 629–637; *Idle Reading*, 837–842
Pearl Fishery, The, of Ceylon, 843–851
Peleus and Thetis, The Marriage of, 302–305
Perry (Walter Copland), *The Employment of Mercenaries in Ancient and Modern Times*, 321–335
Physical reasons against female suffrage, 595–601
Playing at Soldiers, 742–751
Pollock (Lieut.-Col. Alsager), *The 'Spectator' Experimental Company*, 142–149
Pollock (Walter Herries), *Macbeth on the Stage*, 446–457
Pope, The, and France, 27–41
Popular in Literature, A Plea for the, 645–657
Priestley (Lady), *The Homes of Our Food Supply*, 950–960
Private Property at Sea, The Capture of, 918–932
Prothero (George W.), *The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen*, 618–628

RADICALS and a revising Chamber, 349–363
Reformed Church of England, A, 509–516

TEM

Reichstag, The German, and the elections, 209–226
Religion and the Child, 764–775
Reviewers and Reviewed: the New Culture, 980–989
Roman Church, The, and the French Government, 933–949
Royce (Rev. G. Monroe), *English Oral Tradition*, 436–445
Russell (George W. E.), *The Revived Channel Tunnel Project*, 184–185

SALTOUN (Lady), *What shall we do with our Land?* 419–428
Scarlet fever and the milk supply, 950–960
Sculpture, painting, and the dance in ancient Greece, 477–489
Sea Power, Balance of, The British Fleet and the, 377–394
Sélincourt (Basil de), *Giotto in Modern Life*, 76–86
Shakespeare's plays, The staging of, 256–264, 446–457
Shintoism, Buddhism, and education in Japan, 1012–1023
Siam, The King of, and his Country, 902–908
Socialists, Ultramontanes, and the German elections, 209–226, 458–471
Society manners and the decline of chivalry, 287–292
Soldiers, Playing at, 742–751
Somerset (Soldiers), *The Pearl Fishery of Ceylon*, 843–851
South African Loyalty, 727–735
'*Spectator*' *Experimental Company*, 142–149
Spender (J. A.), *A Plea for the Popular in Literature*, 645–657
Stag-hunting in France, 808–820
Stanley of Alderley (Lord), *The Education Bill of 1906 and the Future of Popular Education*, 1–11
Stark (Arthur) and other Norfolk painters, 670–684
Stephen (Leslie), The Life and Letters of, 618–628
Stephen (Miss Caroline E.), *Women and Politics*, 227–236; a Reply to, 472–476; a Rejoinder, 593–594
'*Swadeshi*,' *Indian Administration and*, 892–901
Swettenham (Sir A.), his resignation of Governorship of Jamaica, 909–917

TAXATION based on personal declaration of income, 56–67
'*Temperance Town, A*,' 87–96
Tempest (Adolphus Vane), '*The Decay of Manners*,' 287–292

THO

Thompson (Lady), *Montenegro*, 306–320; *A Ride through Bosnia and the Hercegovina*, 685–700
Timber-trees and forest conservancy in India, 265–286
Tragedy of the 'Ex-,' The, 293–301
Trelawny, Pirate, 798–807
Trout-Streams, Hope for the, 638–644
Tuberculosis, scarlet fever, and dairy-farms, 950–960
Tupper (Sir Charles), *The Problem of Empire*, 701–714
Tweedie (Major-General W.), *The Dogs of Baghdad: a Study from Life*, 1004–1011

UNIONISTS and Tory democracy, 405–418
United Kingdom, Agricultural Education in the, 108–118
United States, Divorce in the, 119–126
Universal Military Training as a Practicable Scheme, 364–376
University teaching and the needs of practical life, 490–500
Unrest in India, The—its Meaning, 873–885

VAUGHAN (Canon), *The Literary Associations of Hampshire*, 658–669
Verney (Frederick), *The King of Siam and his Country*, 902–908

WOR

Voluntary schools and the Education Bill, 1–11
Volunteers and Mr. Haldane's Army Bill, 742–751

WANDERING *Jew, The*, 969–979
Ward (Wilfrid), *The Pope and France*, 27–41
Ware (Fabian), *Conservative Opportunists and Imperial Democracy*, 405–418
Wedlock and divorce, Milton's views upon, 127–135
Weekes (Reginald Newton), *The Curse of Machinery*, 68–75
What to Drink, 833–836
Wheeler (C. B.), *Milton's 'Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce,'* 127–135
'White Flag,' The, in Jamaica, 909–917
Winchester, Literary celebrities of, 658–669
Withers (Hartley), *'Window Dressing' in the Money Market*, 150–162; *The Firmness of Consols*, 821–832
Woman suffrage, 227–236, 472–476
Woman's proper sphere—marriage and motherhood, 593–594
Women and Politics, 227–236; a Reply to, 472–476; two Rejoinders, 593–601
Women criminals and their life in prison, 780–797
World-empire, Our rivals in the struggle for, 715–726

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON